| 1 | IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATESURFICA POLICIONA YAVAPAI COUNTY, ARIZONA | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAL | | | | | |
| 3 | Sandra k Harkham. Clerk | | | | | |
| 4 | STATE OF ARIZONA,) | | | | | |
| 5 | Plaintiff, | | | | | |
| 6 | vs.) Case No. V1300CR201080049 | | | | | |
| 7 | JAMES ARTHUR RAY,) | | | | | |
| 8 | Defendant.) | | | | | |
| 9 | , | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | |
| 14 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS | | | | | |
| 15 | BEFORE THE HONORABLE WARREN R. DARROW | | | | | |
| 16 | TRIAL DAY NINETEEN | | | | | |
| 17 | MARCH 22, 2011 | | | | | |
| 18 | Camp Verde, Arizona | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | |
| 22 | ORIGINAL | | | | | |
| 23 | REPORTED BY | | | | | |
| 24 | MINA G. HUNT AZ CR NO. 50619 | | | | | |
| 25 | CA CSR NO. 8335 | | | | | |

| 1 13 NEE SUDIRICHE CREET OF THE STORE OF ANITONS 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 | | t | | | | | |
|--|----|---|-------------------|---------------------------------|-----|---|---------------------|
| 1 | | | | | 1 | INDEX | 3 |
| FOR TABLE CONTY OF TAXABAL | | 1 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 2 FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI | | | | | |
| ### FIXER OF ANIDON, | | | | | | | PAGE |
| Cross Continued by Mr. Li 37 Redirect by Ms. Polk 236 Redirect by Ms. Polk 241 REPORTED BY Mr. Li 237 Redirect by Ms. Polk 241 REPORTED BY Mr. Li 237 Redirect by Ms. Polk 241 REPORTED BY Mr. Li 237 Redirect by Ms. Polk 241 REPORTED BY Mr. Li 237 Redirect by Ms. Polk 241 REVISION ARTHOR AND BY MS. Polk 241 REVISION ARTHOR ART | | | | | | | |
| Part | | | | , | 5 | | 37 |
| Further redirect by Ms. Polk 236 | | | |) | 6 | • | |
| 1 | 1 | | | } | | • | |
| ## NECONSTRUCTION OF PROCESSING ## NECONSTRUCTION OF PROCESSIN | | | |) Case No V1300CR201080049) | 7 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 237 |
| MELINDA MARTIN Direct by Ms. Polk 241 | | | · |) | 1 | | |
| ### AREONTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 1 | | | Defendant. | · · | 8 | | |
| 1 | | | | | | | 241 |
| 10 | | | | | 9 | Direct by Ms. Polk | 241 |
| EXHIBITS ADMITTED | | | | | 10 | | |
| 11 | | | | | | EXHIBITS ADM | ITTED |
| 15 SEPTICE THE MOCRABILE MARRING R DARROW 12 178,179 137 784 229 178,179 137 784 229 178,179 137 784 229 178,179 137 784 229 188 | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | 178, 179 137 | |
| 13 | | | | | 12 | | |
| 13 | | | | | 12 | 784 229 | |
| 15 | | | | | 13 | | |
| 1 | | | 26 | | 14 | | |
| 1 Proceedings had before the Honorable 2 WARREN R. DARROW, Judge, taken on Tuesday, 3 March 22, 2011, at Yavapai County Superior Court, 4 By: Bill. R. Hughes, ATTORNEY 255 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-3868 6 For the Defendant: 7 THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: TRUC BO, ATTORNEY 425 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 8F: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 355 South Grand Avenue 17 Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 8F: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 550 Mission Street | | | | | 15 | | |
| 1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: 2 For the Plaintiff: 3 YAVAPAI COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BY: SHELIA SULLIVAN POLK, ATTORNEY 2 Z55 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-3868 6 6 6 7 For the Defendant: 7 THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 11 BY: TRUE DO, ATTORNEY 12 BY: RULO SA ATTORNEY 13 BY: RULO SA ATTORNEY 15 BY: RULO SA ATTORNEY 16 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 17 BY: MIRIAM C. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 18 BY: MIRIAM C. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 18 BY: MIRIAM C. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 18 BY: MIRIAM C. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 19 BY: MIRIAM C. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 10 BY: MIRIAM C. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 11 BY: MIRIAM C. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 15 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 18 19 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 22 24 25 | | | | | | | |
| PRESCRETE BY SHELLA SULLIVAN POLK, ATTORNEY 25 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 215 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 215 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 215 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 215 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 215 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 215 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 90071-1560 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 215 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 90071-1560 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 215 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 90071-1560 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 215 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 94105-2907 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 215 East Gurley 215 East Gurl | | 22 | | | | | |
| ### A CONTRACT OF THE PROPERTY | | 23 | | | | | |
| 25 CX CSR NO. 8335 21 22 23 24 25 25 26 25 26 25 26 25 26 25 26 25 26 25 26 25 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 | | 24 | | MINA G. HUNT | | | |
| 22 23 24 25 1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: 2 For the Plaintiff: 3 YAVAPAI COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BY: SHEILA SULLIVAN POLK, ATTORNEY 255 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-3868 6 For the Defendant: 7 THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 9 PRESCOTT, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 355 South Grand Avenue 11 Thrty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 5 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 18 920 21 22 23 23 24 25 5 | | 25 | | | | | |
| 24 25 1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: 2 For the Plaintiff: 3 YAVAPAI COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BY: SHEILA SULLIVAN POLK, ATTORNEY 2.55 East Gurley 5 For the Defendant: 7 THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, ATTORNEY 4.25 East Gurley 9 Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 3.55 South Grand Avenue 12 Thrty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY So Mission Street San Francisco, California 94105-2907 16 17 20 20 21 22 23 23 24 24 25 5 | | | | | | | |
| 25 1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: 2 For the Plaintiff: 3 YAVAPAL COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BY: SHEILA SULLIVAN POLK, ATTORNEY 4 BY: BILL R. HUGHES, ATTORNEY 5 For the Defendant: 7 THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, ATTORNEY 425 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 18 BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 255 South Grand Avenue 17 Thurty-fifth Floor 18 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 18 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 50 Mission Street 51 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 52 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 53 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 54 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 55 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 56 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 57 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 58 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 59 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 50 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 51 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 51 San Francisco, California 9 | | | | | | | |
| 1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: 2 For the Plaintiff: 3 YAVAPAI COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BY: SHEILA SULLIVAN POLK, ATTORNEY 4 BY: BILL R. HUGHES, ATTORNEY 5 Prescott, Arizona 86301-3868 6 For the Defendant: 7 THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, ATTORNEY 9 Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 11 BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 12 BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 13 SS South Grand Avenue 14 Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 15 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 16 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 17 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 18 PY MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 18 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 19 CONTROL OF THE MERCAN CONT | | | | | | | |
| 1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: 2 For the Plaintiff: 3 YAVAPAI COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BY: SHEILA SULLIVAN POLK, ATTORNEY 4 BY: BILL R. HUGHES, ATTORNEY 255 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-3868 6 For the Defendant: 7 THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, ATTORNEY 425 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 355 South Grand Avenue 12 Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 50 Mission Pro Tem B, 2840 North Commonwealth Drive, Comp Verde, Arizona, before Mina G. Hunt, Certified Reporter within and for the State of Arizona. 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 11 BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 12 Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 15 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 16 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 17 18 19 20 21 22 21 22 23 24 24 25 | | | | 2 | 25 | | |
| 2 For the Plaintiff: 3 YAVAPAI COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BY: SHEILA SULLIVAN POLK, ATTORNEY 4 BY: BILL R. HUGHES, ATTORNEY 5 Prescott, Arizona 86301-3868 6 For the Defendant: 7 THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, ATTORNEY 9 Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 12 Thirty-fifth Floor 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 5 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 18 P9 18 P1 18 P1 18 P2 19 Prescott, Arizona 94105-2907 18 P9 20 21 22 22 23 24 24 25 | 1 | APPEARA | NCES OF COUNSE | | | | • |
| 3 YAVAPAI COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BY: SHEILA SULLIVAN POLK, ATTORNEY BY: BILL R. HUGHES, ATTORNEY 5 Prescott, Arizona 86301-3868 6 6 6 7 For the Defendant: 7 THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, ATTORNEY 9 Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 355 South Grand Avenue 1 Thyt-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 57 18 19 17 18 19 17 18 19 20 21 22 21 22 23 24 24 25 | , | 2 For the Disputiff | | | 1 | Proceedings had before the Honorable | |
| BY: SHEILA SULLIVAN POLK, ATTORNEY BY: BILL R. HUGHES, ATTORNEY STATEMENT ST | - | For the Plaintin: | | | 2 | WARREN R. DARROW, Judge, taken on Tuesday, | |
| 4 BY: BILL R. HUGHES, ATTORNEY 255 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-3868 6 For the Defendant: 7 THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, ATTORNEY 425 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 18 BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 255 South Grand Avenue 12 Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: MRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 15 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 18 19 20 21 21 22 23 22 23 24 24 25 | 3 | | | | 3 | March 22, 2011, at Yavapai County Superior Court, | |
| 255 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-3868 6 For the Defendant: 7 THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, ATTORNEY 425 East Gurley Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 355 South Grand Avenue Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP STRUC DO, ATTORNEY 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 14 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 15 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 18 19 17 18 19 20 21 22 21 22 23 24 24 24 24 24 25 | 4 | | | | 4 | Division Pro Tem B, 2840 North | Commonwealth Drive, |
| 6 For the Defendant: 7 THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, ATTORNEY 425 East Gurley 9 Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: UIS LI, ATTORNEY 11 BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 255 South Grand Avenue 12 Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 14 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 15 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 16 17 17 18 19 19 20 21 22 21 22 23 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 | | 255 Ea | ast Gurley | | 5 | | |
| For the Defendant: 7 THOMAS K. KELLY, PC 8 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, ATTORNEY 425 East Gurley 9 Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 11 BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 12 Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 15 16 17 18 19 17 18 19 20 21 21 22 21 22 23 24 24 25 | 5 | Presco | tt, Arizona 86301 | 3868 | | • | |
| THOMAS K. KELLY, PC B BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, ATTORNEY 425 East Gurley 9 Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 11 BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 355 South Grand Avenue 12 Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 14 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 15 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 18 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 21 22 23 24 24 25 | 6 | | | | | Reporter within and for the State | e of Affzona. |
| THOMAS K. KELLY, PC BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, ATTORNEY 425 East Gurley 9 Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 11 BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 12 Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 15 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 18 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 21 22 23 23 24 24 25 | _ | For the D | efendant: | | 7 | | |
| 8 BY: THOMAS K. KËLLY, ATTORNEY 425 East Gurley 9 Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 11 BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 355 South Grand Avenue 12 Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 14 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 560 Mission Street 17 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 18 19 17 18 19 20 21 22 21 22 23 23 24 24 24 25 | / | THOMA | AS K. KELLY. PC | | 8 | | |
| 9 | 8 | BY: Ti | HOMAS K. KELLY, | ATTORNEY | 9 | | |
| 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 11 BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 355 South Grand Avenue 12 Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 14 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 17 15 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 18 19 10 17 18 19 20 21 20 21 22 21 22 23 24 24 25 | ۵ | | | -0001 | 10 | | |
| 10 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY 11 BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 355 South Grand Avenue 12 Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 14 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 15 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 16 19 17 18 19 20 21 22 21 22 23 24 24 25 | | FIESCO | , A1120110 00301 | . 0001 | | | |
| 11 BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY 355 South Grand Avenue 12 Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 14 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 15 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 18 16 19 17 18 20 18 19 20 21 21 22 23 23 24 24 25 | 10 | | | | 1 | | |
| 355 South Grand Avenue 12 Thirty-fifth Floor Los Angeles, California 90071-1560 13 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 14 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 17 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 18 19 17 18 19 20 21 22 21 22 21 22 23 24 25 | 11 | | | | | | |
| Los Ángeles, California 90071-1560 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 14 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 15 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 16 19 17 20 18 21 20 22 21 22 21 22 23 24 24 25 | | 355 Sc | outh Grand Avenu | | l l | | |
| 13 | 12 | | | 00071.1560 | 14 | | |
| MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 14 BY: MIRIAM L. SEIFTER, ATTORNEY 560 Mission Street 15 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 16 17 18 19 17 18 19 20 21 22 21 22 23 24 24 25 | 13 | LOS AN | geles, California | 200/1-1200 | 15 | | |
| 560 Mission Street 15 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 18 16 19 17 18 20 18 19 20 21 22 21 22 23 23 24 24 25 | | | | | 16 | | |
| 15 San Francisco, California 94105-2907 16 19 17 20 18 21 29 21 20 22 21 23 24 24 25 25 | 14 | | | , A ITORNEY | 17 | | |
| 16 | 15 | | | 94105-2907 | | | |
| 17 20 21 21 22 22 23 23 24 25 25 | 10 | | | | | | |
| 18 21 19 22 20 22 21 23 23 24 24 25 | '0 | | | | | | |
| 19 21 22 22 23 23 24 24 25 25 | | | | | 20 | | |
| 20 | | | | | 21 | | |
| 21 22 23 24 24 25 | 20 | | | | 22 | | |
| 22 23 24 24 25 25 | 21 | | | | 1 | | |
| 24 25 25 | 22 | | | | - 1 | | |
| 25 | 24 | | | | | | |
| | 25 | | | | | | |

PROCEEDING

2 (Proceedings continued outside presence 3

of jury.) 4

1

7

9

10

11

14

15

22

23

24

9

17

18

19

20

21

22

THE COURT: The record will show the presence of the defendant, Mr. Ray, the attorneys. The jury is not present. This is the time set to discuss legal matters, specifically the proposed testimony of an expert, Mr. Pace. And just for purposes of trial management, that's an issue that needs to be dealt with. And I look at that in terms of a motion in limine.

And so I think, Mr. Li, you should 12 13 proceed.

MR. LI: Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning. THE COURT: Good morning.

16 MR. LI: The first thing is I won't repeat a 17 lot of the argument that we've already made. But at issue here is whether or not testimony related 18 19 to certain risk management practices are admissible 20 in a case where no legal duty has been identified and impose those risk management practices. 21

In particular, Your Honor, if I may approach, just so we're all very clear on what we're discussing here, I'm going to approach with

Mr. Pace's report so that it's clear that -- I

think the state already has a copy. 1

2 THE COURT: And this was attached to a 3 disclosure --

4 MR. LI: Yes.

5 THE COURT: -- that I saw.

6 MR. LI: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. I just 7 want to make sure that we all have it in front of

8 each other.

I would direct the Court's attention to the first sentence, essentially, which is, in order 10 11 to review the overall safety of an organization and the activities it conducts, one needs to scrutinize 12 the overall risk management plan that the 13 organization has put into place to ensure the 14 15 well-being of its participants and the quality of 16 its program.

And then the report goes on to state various things that -- you know -- Mr. Pace believes should be in any outdoor adventure program, including a medical screening, all sorts of other -- you know -- areas that Mr. Pace believes should be in a program.

23 Now, the state contends that his 24 testimony is admissible to show that JRI or Mr. Ray 25 in particular somehow fell beneath those standards

in a criminal rashion. And that is the issue here

is whether or not those sorts of -- this sort of

testimony is admissible in a criminal case as 3

opposed to a civil case. 4

Just to go back very quickly about the 5

law. I think that the main problem with the

7 testimony is that it continues to inflate civil

8 liability with criminal liability. And I've

already discussed with the Court some of the basic 9

elements required in order to find that -- an 10

omission, which is what the state, essentially, 11

alleges -- the failure to have a defibrillator, the 12

failure to have -- you know -- what they believe 13

would be a better risk management plan, et cetera, 14

all of those sorts of omissions.

The way that an omission can be used 16 against an individual is only if under the criminal 17 law there is an identified beyond dispute clear 18 duty under the criminal law that the individual do 19 20 something.

And I will very quickly read two quotes 21 from two separate cases. One is Angelo. That's 22 the tax return case we discussed. And in that 23 case -- that's at 166 Arizona, and this is at

24

page 27. An omission to act can only be a crime if 25

6

15

there is a duty to act imposed by law. Because in 1

this case, the tax returns, the officers had no 2

underlined express duty. Quote, they cannot be 3

charged with the omission to perform that duty and 4

be criminally liable for the failure to file the

6 return.

11

Another case which was cited by the Far 7

West case with approval is a New Jersey case 8

9 entitled -- sorry.

10 THE COURT: Is it Lisa?

MR. LI: Lisa. Correct.

THE COURT: I needed the cite on that too if 12

13 you have that.

14 MR. LI: I do. I just have a copy of it. If

I could bring it up. 15

THE COURT: Does the state have that cite in 16

this case? 17

MR. HUGHES: Mr. Li, could give us the cite or 18 19 a copy?

MR. LI: Yes. I will give you the cite. 20

The cite is 919 A.2d 145. And the case

22 is from 2007.

THE COURT: Thank you. 23

MR. LI: I only have one copy. May I approach

25 with it?

2 of 69 sheets

21

THE COURT: That's okay. I'm able to get this 2 quickly.

MR. LI: Okay. This case is cited with approval by the Far West case. And it states that to the extent that New Jersey, quote, seeks to incorporate principles derived from civil common law, it, quote, does not provide sufficient notice

to satisfy prevailing standards of

constitutionality adequate procedural due process. 9

10 And that's at page 160.

1

3

7

18

19

20

21

22

23

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A duty of care upon which a duty to act 11 12 is premised must be so firmly established as to be beyond controversy or dispute if it is to provide 13 14 presumed notice. And the Court noted that we 15 failed to see how these civil common law principles could provide adequate notice to justify a criminal 16 17 charge.

And the Court went on to state, in this case, the duty charged by the state, the Court concluded, was based on amorphous concepts of the restatement as reflected in some civil cases and thereby failed the fundamental test of due process notice.

24 So it has been critical from day one in this prosecution that to the extent the state wants 25

yesterday. And they again failed to identify any 1 legal duty Mr. Ray owed the decedents. The duties the state cites are either legally barred or 3

4 plainly inapposite to Mr. Ray.

5 I'll start with one. I think the first thing identified is that the duty is simply to not 6

violate the recklessness provisions of Arizona law. 7

That has explicitly been found by Arizona courts 8 9 not to supply a duty.

In fact, in State v. Brown, the very case 10 that the state cites, the Court says in the case of 11 negligent homicide or manslaughter, the duty must 12 be found outside the definition of the crime 13 14 itself.

THE COURT: We were discussing that last week; 15 16 am I right?

17 MR. LI: Yes.

And the state devotes a fair amount of 18 time in its pleadings to say that, in fact, the 19 recklessness statute is the statute that supplies 20 the duty to Mr. Ray. There is a case directly on 21 point that rebuts that legal claim, which is, 22 frankly, just simply incorrect. 23

The second legal duty that the state 24 25

purports to supply is an employer-employee duty.

10

to premise criminal liability on a purported 1

2 omission, that the state identify a specific,

3 clear-as-day duty under the Arizona law that

4 requires some sort of action on the part of Mr. Ray

5 individually, the failure of which would, then,

impose criminal liability. 6

7 THE COURT: All right. And I just want to ask in that regard, Mr. Li, did you see the state's 8 recent memorandum? 9

10 MR. LI: I did.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LI: And I'll address that quickly.

13 THE COURT: All right.

> MR. LI: And so that's the groundwork. That's just the background that we've sort of laid out in our motions, in our various arguments; and frankly two separate motions, one related to Mr. Pace and one related to sort of the overall area about whether first-aid kits and the like are -- you know -- questions about that are admissible.

And we've made our various arguments. I don't think there is any dispute that that's what the law actually is. And I think any review of the cases establishes that.

Now, the state has filed a pleading

And even assuming that such a duty provided some

2 form of criminal liability, it would only apply to

the company. Nobody is making any allegation nor 3

can someone make the allegation that any employee 4

or anybody who is working on behalf of JRI was 5

working on behalf of Mr. Ray personally. 6

7 I mean, it's beyond dispute that there is a company. The company puts on these events and 8 9 seminars. The company provides all the paperwork.

There is a whole infrastructure to the company. 10

There is 27 employees. 11

And the fact that the state has cited a 12 case in which -- you know -- the employer-employee 13 relationship might create some sort of duty only 14 proves our point, which is that the only duty flows 15 between the employer, JRI, and the employee, 16 whoever that person might be, not an agent, 17 officer, or, frankly, employee. Mr. Ray is also an 18 employee of JRI.

19 The third duty that the -- the purported 20 duty that the state cites is the landlord -- or the 21 business proprietor's duty to keep his premises 22 reasonably safe. It's beyond dispute that the 23 premises here were not owned by Mr. Ray, but they 24 were, in fact, owned by Angel Valley.

14

And so to the extent that there is any landlord-invitee relationship, that relationship only exists between Angel Valley and the people who have been invited onto Angel Valley. You cannot take that duty and then superimpose it onto somebody who's actually rented it.

1

2

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Now, Mr. Hughes cites one exception, which is that if there is the affirmative knowledge that there is some defect on the land, then there might be some ability to impose a liability onto the renter. Okay. But the defect in this case would have to be something wrong with the land, something wrong with the premises.

And as the Court is well aware, one of the arguments that we're making here and we believe is, in fact, the case is that there may have been some sort of toxins and that the -- but we'll never find out because the site was destroyed -- you know -- less than 48 hours after the incident.

There is no allegation on the part of the 21 state nor can there ever be an allegation on the part of the state that somehow JRI or Mr. Ray or somebody could have been aware of some sort of toxins or something like that in the soil, in the wood, in Lord knows what at Angel Valley. That

liability cannot be imposed upon Mr. Ray as an individual.

So the problem that the state has done here is they've, essentially, sought to introduce all sorts of evidence that, essentially, are purported omissions under a purported standard of care.

They've supplied no duty whatsoever that requires -- no explicit duty under the criminal law that requires that an individual in Mr. Ray's position do any of these things.

There isn't a single case out there or statute or anything that requires an officer of a company conducting outdoor activities to have a defibrillator or to have a more robust first aid kit or to have different sort of risk-management practices.

We submit that all of the things that Mr. Pace discusses are probably good ideas for outdoor, Bound and NOLS and all of these various outdoor activities. We're not disputing that some of these might be good ideas. We would contend that a lot of these things were done by JRI.

24 All that said, it's irrelevant because 25 none of -- there is no statute anywhere that

1 requires Mr. Ray as an individual in a criminal

prosecution to do any of those things. And as a

consequence, there is no due process or notice that

failure to do any of those things would result in 4

criminal charges, specifically manslaughter 5

charges. 6

7 And so that's the problem that the state faces, and their pleading, Your Honor, with all due 8

respect, fails in all respects. It, essentially, 9

says that, well, actually this is an action. 10

Mr. Ray is liable because he committed an 11

affirmative act rather than an omission. Well, if 12

that's the case, then none of Mr. Pace's testimony 13

14 is relevant. None of it has anything to do with

action. It all has to do with what he believes 15

is -- that an outdoor program should have. And 16

so -- you know -- if that's their theory, then 17

Mr. Pace's testimony is irrelevant. 18

And then with respect to the omissions, 19 that is, the purported failures to have certain 20 procedures in place, they failed to identify any 21 duty. And as a consequence, Your Honor, we believe 22 that Mr. Pace's testimony should be excluded. 23

24 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Li. Mr. Hughes. 25

1 MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Your Honor.

2 Your Honor, although I don't think it makes any difference, but the document Mr. Li 3

provided you is a draft of Mr. Pace's report. The 4

part that Mr. Li highlighted is the same as the 5

actual report, which has Bates No. 6700. 6

7 MR. LI: You Honor, I'll approach with a copy 8 of that one as well.

9 THE COURT: Okay.

observe in the situation.

10 MR. LI: It wasn't clear to us which one constituted disclosure. 11

MR. HUGHES: The issue, Your Honor, I believe, 12 really is what Mr. Li touched on at the very end, 13 which is, is Mr. Pace's testimony relevant to the 14 issue of Mr. Ray's conduct. 15

In determining Mr. Ray's conduct, you 16 have to look at the reasonable-person statute, 17 which is part of the manslaughter statute. And 18 that reasonable-person statute talks about the risk 19 must be of such nature and degree that disregard of 20 such risk constitutes a gross deviation from the 21 22 standard of conduct that a reasonable person would

24 In the Far West case, the state was permitted to bring an expert in to testify about 25

24 25

18

that regard.

what a reasonable person would observe or would do

2 in the situation. Now, Far West dealt with a

situation where an employer and also some of the

managerial agents of the employer were being

prosecuted for crimes that they committed,

including their acts and also including their

7 omissions or violations of duty.

8

9

10

11

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In the memorandum that the state filed yesterday, I was trying to illustrate that a prosecution for manslaughter can be brought solely on a person's act. In other words, there is no 12 requirement under a manslaughter prosecution that a 13 defendant violate a duty of any form. And I gave a 14 number of examples of published appellate cases where the prosecution and the appellate opinion 16 were based on acts by a defendant.

That's one of the theories that are being brought forward in this case is that Mr. Ray's act in running that sweat lodge, particularly in light of the testimony that we've heard, constituted recklessness.

As I also pointed out in the memorandum that was filed yesterday, a prosecution for manslaughter can be premised on a violation of a duty. And that was one of the situations in the

Far West case. Also in the Brown case it talked about a duty that a person can owe can be found in the common law.

I realize Mr. Li has cited the Lisa case from another state. I would submit that the Lisa case is contradicted by Arizona's case law, which is very clear. In particular, the Brown case is very clear that a duty can be founded upon the common law.

And in this particular case, I gave in the memorandum several duties, one of them that a proprietor owes to patrons. Mr. Li's attempting to distinguish that by saying, well, in this case Mr. Ray was, first of all, an employee of JRI. I 14 think that argument is addressed by 13-306 and the 15 cases that I cited about 306 -- or not the case. But it was a horn book on 13-306 that addressed that.

It says that a managerial agent cannot hide behind the corporate veil when his own acts are responsible for committing the crime in addition to the acts of the corporation.

And I think 13-306 needs to be used as the lens when you're looking at the duties and the failure to perform those duties that Mr. Ray owed

to the victims with respect to proprietor. 1

We've heard testimony that Mr. Ray was 2 the one, basically, running the show as far as the 3 sweat lodge, determining the amount of heat, the 4 amount of rocks, when the door could open and when 5 the door couldn't open, telling people when they 6 could leave or when they couldn't leave. He can't 7 hide behind the corporate veil for his own acts in 8

10 And the duty as a proprietor to provide a safe place to the customers also is not removed 11 12 simply because Mr. Ray was in that land and the land was owned by Angel Valley. Mr. Ray was, 13 essentially, renting the land from Angel Valley to 14 provide the sweat lodge. 15

There will be testimony that the sweat 16 lodge was constructed by Angel Valley at Mr. Ray's 17 request and that it was constructed solely for use 18 19 by Mr. Ray running the sweat lodge ceremony. The fact that Angel Valley also had an interest in the 20 land doesn't negate the fact that Mr. Ray had an 21 interest as well by virtue of the contractual 22 23 agreement he had with Angel Valley.

So that's one duty that he owed to all of the customers, the patrons, and the people who were

there, the business invitees. 1

In addition, Liz Neuman is in a special 2 situation because she's an employee, a gratuitous 3

employee to go along with it. She was 4

volunteering. But when you look at that two-part 5

test, Ms. Neuman falls squarely within the two-part 6

test. She was working for Mr. Ray, subject to his 7

8 instruction and his direction.

You heard testimony that when she didn't 9 do something that Mr. Ray thought she should have 10 done, i.e., the no alcohol, she got chewed out by 11 Mr. Ray. 12

I think that also goes to show that not 13 14 only was there the JRI issue, but under 13-306, 15 there is Mr. Ray's liability directly to Liz Neuman. He's the person who is acting as that high 16 managerial agent with respect to Liz Neuman. 17

And so to sum it all up, Your Honor, with 18 respect to Mr. Pace, he's going to provide 19 testimony, which Far West says is appropriate in a 20 criminal case, as to what a reasonable person 21 22 should do.

23 That testimony is relevant, not only to the duties that are outlined in the memorandum as 24 filed yesterday, but it's also relevant to what a 25

20

Page 17 to 20 of 275

reasonable person should do with respect to Mr. Ray's conduct.

1

2

3

4

5

7

13

15

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

Mr. Li argued that Mr. Pace is going to talk about what an organization should do. And I would agree that his report is styled in order to review the overall safety of an organization and the activities it conducts.

8 Mr. Pace's testimony in this case will not be focused on JRI. It's going to be focused on 9 what the leader of that organization, in other 10 words, the 13-306 actor, should do or should not do 11 12 in the case of running an adventure program.

And it goes far beyond the providing of 14 medical kits and having an ambulance on scene. Although that's some of what's required, there are 16 other things such, as sitting down and doing safety reviews. After the incidents in prior years, 17 Mr. Ray should have done safety reviews and gone 18 over with his employees the things that they should 19 have learned and the things that should be done 20 differently.

There are other requirements in that draft and also in the final completed report of things that Mr. Ray should have done as a responsible leader of an organization.

For those reasons, Your Honor, Mr. Pace should be allowed to provide testimony to the jury of what a reasonable person in Mr. Ray's situation should have done.

5 Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hughes.

Mr. Li.

MR. LI: Your Honor, just quickly, on one of the statutes provided by Mr. Hughes, 13-306, is applicable only to affirmative acts and not to omissions. This doesn't create an additional duty. 12 It explicitly relates only to affirmative acts.

I think the critical thing is this: Far West cites with approval the Lisa case that I discussed. It quotes, basically, what I read to the Court here. And the point is that absent an explicit legal duty, you cannot impose criminal liability on an individual for an omission.

Everything that Mr. Hughes said is -once again demonstrates this conflation, this sort of mushing between civil liability, corporate liability, and what the cases, such as Angelo, say, which is in order to impose an individual liability, you better identify a specific duty that

applies. The state has not done so.

2 that it is not a duty explicitly so under Arizona law not to commit criminal recklessness. So every 3 case that the state cites involving people shooting 4 guns in people's faces and such, those are all 5 6 irrelevant for purposes of this analysis. 7 The common law duties cited, No. 1, it's

I would just, for the record, say again

not clear that Arizona law recognizes imposing 8 criminal sanctions for the violation of common law 9 duties. The Angelo case seems to suggest that it 10 has to be explicitly stated in a statute. And the 11 12 state cites no -- absolutely no precedent for the 13 opposite.

But even if the common law duties that 14 the state is citing here apply, they apply to the 15 wrong party. With respect to the employer-employee 16 relationship, it applies to JRI, not to Mr. Ray 17 personally. It would be -- you know -- Mr. Hughes 18 is the employee of a large company or a large 19 20 organization and failures on the part of Yavapai County Attorney's Office -- you know -- omissions 21 and the like, relate to the company, to his 22 employer, not to Ms. Polk. 23 24

Similarly, the landlord-invitee duty -the common law landlord-invitee duty that the state 25

cites, even assuming, which we don't concede --

2 even assuming that Arizona law recognizes that such

a duty -- a criminal duty could arise out of that, 3

that duty runs between the invitees and Angel 4

Valley. 5

6

15

22

Nobody is trying to hide behind anything.

But the point is that in order for the state to 7

bring a criminal prosecution based on omissions, 8

9 they've got to identify a real duty. They can't

construct one out of -- you know -- out of vague 10

concepts and arguments. 11

They have to actually have a duty. 12

13 They've never identified one. And as a

consequence, Mr. Pace's testimony is irrelevant. 14

Frankly, all of the testimony relating to first-aid

kits and the like we maintain is irrelevant. 16

THE COURT: I've already ruled with regard 17 to 2009. The presence of those items or absence of 18 those items just relates to what was going on at 19 that time. I think the question with regard to 20

21 Mr. Pace and the larger issue of is negligence type

22 evidence permissible in a reckless manslaughter

case. That's the issue that I see right now. And 23

there is no summary judgment procedure in a 24

criminal case in Arizona. So we are strictly 25

talking about what is potential relevant evidence. 2

Mr. Hughes, I think this is a related argument. Your disclosure now includes a suggestion that conducting of the Samurai Game would be relevant, whether it was authorized.

There was a 15.6 notice on that and motion.

You know what I'm talking about.

MR. HUGHES: Yes, sir.

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And I think that's related to the issue here. And at the end of the motion, there is just a statement that the question of Mr. Ray properly conducting those games is relevant to the charge of manslaughter.

How would it be.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I think the defense has made the way the defendant conducted that game relevant through their questions to the witnesses. They've opened the door, essentially, to that area by asking questions along the lines of, well, did you know that Mr. Ray runs this game and it's the same game that the Disney Corporation runs and the U.S. military runs? And maybe they said IBM or some of the other companies.

24 The fact that he's not licensed to run the game and that the testimony here on how he's 25

running the game, we believe, is going to differ from how an authorized facilitator of the game should run it, I think, is relevant because the defense has made that issue relevant.

If they hadn't of gone down that line of questioning with the witnesses, then it would be different. But they did go down that line. They've left the impression now in the jury's minds

that the way Mr. Ray runs his game is the same way 9

10 that Disney and the U.S. military and all these 11 other really prominent -- AT&T and these other 12 prestigious corporations run the game.

Certainly the game in and of itself is relevant because it affected the participants and the victims' overall mental state once they entered the sweat lodge.

But the specific issue of was he licensed and is he running this game the same way that it's supposed to be run or the same way other corporations that are licensed to run it runs the game has been something that the defense has created through that line of questioning.

They didn't have to go down the line of saying is this the same game that Disney runs? For example, are you aware that Disney does this game also? The face that the game that Mr. Ray calls

the "Samurai Game" happens to have some

similarities and the same name as what Disney is 3

doing or AT&T is doing or the U.S. military, I 4

think, now is fair for the jury to explore that 5

through testimony that we can put on. 6

7 So that's where that issue has come from is the defendant creating that -- what we believe 8 is a misimpression that this is the same game and 9 runs substantially the same way. 10

THE COURT: I see that as a related issue 11 because there may be this tendency to just have 12 propensity type evidence out there. And if you 13 pull back to the charge, it's recklessness. It's a 14 very specific charge that actually has an element 15 of knowing in it. 16

It's a conscious disregard. And bringing 17 in these other things that don't really go directly 18 to that, whether it's some omission that might be 19 20 made in running an outdoor program. And I see the concepts as related, and they are of concern. The 21 issue is somewhat different. 22

Mr. Li, I think you may have wanted to 24 address the point that I brought up about the recent disclosure. 25

23

26

1 MR. LI: Yes, Your Honor. I mean, obviously 2 we'll deal with that in a separate pleading. And 3 we're not here to litigate that particular issue. Two points I wanted to make. One is 4

that -- I wrote it here but I didn't say it -- to 5

the extent that the state is now alleging that 6

Mr. Pace is going to talk about something different 7

than what's in his report, we claim that's a 8 disclosure violation. 9

10 The second is that -- you know -- this entire issue about the Samurai Game, as the Court 11 12 will recall from the beginning, the defense has questioned the relevance of that. And we have 13 argued repeatedly that we think it is an attempt to 14 introduce propensity evidence and, essentially, 15 16 introduce evidence against -- in violation of 403.

We understand the Court's ruling, and 17 we've abided by it. When this case began, as the 18 Court will recall, there were many, many questions 19 of the various witnesses that sort of went along 20 these lines. And then Mr. Ray commanded somebody 21 to die; isn't that correct? Things like that, this 22

23

entire sort of almost sensationalizing of this what I would just call a silly corporate game into some 24

sort of death cult. 25

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And there were lots of conversations with witnesses about after you had been commanded to die by Mr. Ray, were you dragged to the graveyard? Those sorts of things.

1

2

3

5

7

9

10

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so the argument that somehow the defense in an attempt to clear up the fact that this is not part of a death cult but this is actually just a corporate exercise that most people who participated in thought was silly or at least recognized clearly that it was all pretend.

The fact that we are simply trying to 11 12 clear up the misimpression that the state brought 13 into this case, which we've always claimed is 14 propensity evidence and in violation of 403, that 15 that somehow opened the door to now bringing in somebody who is going to say, well, we've licensed 16 the Samurai Game, and this is how we play it; and 17 if Mr. Ray plays it differently, that is not okay, 18 this will be the subject of a separate motion. 19 20

But it simply defies -- you know -- our sense of justice that the state can sit here and make that argument having made numerous what we consider improper questions, numerous arguments, in front of the jury -- essentially, arguments in

25 front of jury that this was some part of cultic

.....

exercise as opposed to what it is, which is just a silly team-building exercise similar to many other silly team-building exercises.

MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, if I could address just a couple of points. First of all, with respect to the defense's argument that they're responding to some sort of misleading or improper testimony about the Samurai Game, I'd note that the defense first brought that issue up about Disney Corporation and U.S. military in his opening argument before there was -- any testimony had been put on.

And, again, the defense chose to bring up the fact that this is supposedly the same game that other corporations have used. If they had limited their examination to what the game involved, eggs on spoons, and that sort of thing, it would be different. But they went down the road as to who else is using what they are calling the same game as what Mr. Ray was doing.

With respect to claiming a discovery violation, Far West and all the cases talk about a corporation acts through its employees. And certainly 13-306 recognizes that also, that employees are liable for the their own conduct.

Mr. ace's report, which talks about what an organization should do, the defense, I don't think with a straight face, can argue that organization in that case did not mean its high managerial agent. And the only high managerial agent in this corporation is Mr. Ray.

So just to say that Mr. Pace's testimony
is somehow limited just to what an organization
does overlooks the fact that organizations that
are -- although they're a real person in one sense,
they act through its employees.

And the Far West case spent some time talking about the high managerial agents. And one of the codefendants was the actual owner of the Far West Corporation in that case.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I'm going to look over the cases, read the Lisa case specifically, and issue something in writing that will be in the context of Mr. Pace's proposed testimony. I think that's a good way to capture and focus the concern.

I wanted to talk about trial scheduling.

I think we're going to get a jury question this morning having to do with the list of witnesses.

25 If you will recall, during the voir dire I

30

1 mentioned at one point I was going to provide a2 list of witnesses to the jurors. That was because

2 list of witnesses to the jurors. That was becau3 of the number of names.

I thought if they could actually see them, if there was any possibility they might

6 recognize somebody rather than reading 70 names or

7 how many I read, they could actually see them.

8 But apparently one of the jurors has
9 asked the bailiff about having that list,
10 remembering that I had said that. And Ms. Rybar,
11 of course, instructed them, put the question in
12 writing so that it could be addressed with the
13 attorneys.

If you recall, I decided not to give them
the list after I talked to both the parties and you
didn't think it was necessary because these people
did not live locally and the chances of anybody
knowing any of these people was so remote.

knowing any of these people was so remote.
I have a feeling -- I don't know this.
It's speculation -- that the concern with the
witness list is they're adding -- this juror is
adding up how many witnesses have testified and how
many might testify in the future and saying,
goodness, the Judge read all these. How many are

there? And we've now heard how many? Nine or 10

Page 29 to 32 of 275

witnesses.

1 2 So I do want to talk about trial scheduling. One of the defense attorneys raised 3 that on Friday. I can say that the examinations by 5 both sides are lengthy. There have been objections, and they're dealt with as they come up. 7 But Mr. Hughes and Ms. Polk, Mr. Li, Mr. Kelly, I do want to talk about trial scheduling. 9

I had permitted a break in the trial really with the understanding there was a good chance the trial would not get to the point of that hiatus. But where does that stand?

12 13 Mr. Hughes and Ms. Polk.

And I want the defense to address that as

15 well.

10

11

14

16

17

18

19

20

2 3

5

MS. POLK: Your Honor, the -- first of all, I agree with the Court that what was given to the jury was a pretty lengthy list of names. I made it clear in my opening to the jury that obviously we weren't going to call everybody who was at the scene because they were so numerous.

21 22 I don't see a problem with finishing on time. We are constantly looking at the list of 23 witnesses, making determinations about whether or 24 not that information has come in through another 25

witness, and do we still need that witness. Beyond that, I don't feel a concern that we will be able to finish on time.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. Kelly, you raised this point last

week. 6

7 MR. KELLY: Judge, I believe our concern is simply one of mathematics; that is, if my 8 calculations are correct, the government has almost

10 finished it's ninth witness. Ms. Polk provided to

us a list of the proposed witnesses this week, 11

12 which totals five. So nine and five is 14. We

13 also -- and I asked this specific question last

14 Friday: Do you still intend to call 70-plus

witnesses? And the answer was yes. And so doing 15

16 the simple math, we can't make it by June 10.

17 I have my own opinion as to the relevance of some of the evidence that's been proffered by 18

the State of Arizona. And I will say that many 19

20 times the direct examination forces a strategy

decision on behalf of the defense as to how long 21

22 our cross-examination is because we don't know

23 whether what you had for breakfast the day after

the event closed is somehow creating some 24

impression of the mind -- in the minds of the juror

that needs to be cleared up on cross-examination. 1 So I understand that our cross has perhaps been

more lengthy than we anticipated.

As you stated, Judge, I thought that this 4 case was going to be completed by the May break 5 that you've identified. That was my original 6

opinion. In fact, I have even set some jury trials 7

at the end of May in some other divisions believing 8 9 that to be true.

And it's largely because we had thought 10 that the crucial inquiry in this case in terms of 11 relevance is what had happened in the sweat lodge 12 and not all these other topics that have been 13 discussed by various motions. 14

Regardless of that, Judge, as I stand 15 here today, I understand you're ruling last Friday. 16 I made some representations in court yesterday 17 based on that, that I would be done by June 10. 18 And it's kind of a simple math problem. I don't 19 see how that's going to happen in an eight-hour 20

21 Now, Ms. Polk has said she's going to cut 22 back on some witnesses, and obviously we can make 23

it a point to not have as many witnesses. But by 24

the end of this week, I believe we will have used 25

34

about a third of your time with 14 witnesses. And,

of course, we need a couple of days for the defense 2 3 case.

THE COURT: With regard to the anticipated 4

juror question, if it comes, I don't plan on giving 5

them the list of witnesses. I think I just explained that that was a list of possible 7

witnesses and the reason for having that was to

9 give them a chance to identify people and that

wasn't really necessary. I don't plan on giving 10

them any list of witnesses. 11

Ms. Polk?

13 MS. POLK: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Li? 14

MR. LI: That's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Then I do have one 16 other matter. And we should start pretty close to 17 18

9:15, I think.

MR. LI: Thank you. 19

20 (Recess.)

(Proceedings continued in the presence of

22 jury.)

12

15

21

THE COURT: The record will show the presence 23 of the defendant, Mr. Ray, the attorneys, and the 24 jury. And the witness, Ms. Gennari, has returned

- 37 1 to the witness stand and is under oath, of course. 2 And, Mr. Li, you were cross-examining? 3 MR. LI: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) 4 BY MR. LI: 5 Q. Good morning, Ms. Gennari. 6 7 Α. Morning. 8 Q. Now, let's talk a little bit about before the sweat lodge, if we could. People were told 9 repeatedly to hydrate? 10 11 A. Over that morning. Yes. **Q.** Over the whole seminar; correct? 12 13 Hydrate, hydrate, hydrate? A. I only remember that morning. 14 15 Q. You only remember that morning? Α. I only remember those words on that 16 17 mornina. 18 Q. And you don't remember Mr. Ray saying 19 hydrate, hydrate for the rest of the 20 seminar? 21 Α. Not that particular set of words. 22 Q. What about drink water? 23 There was a comment about -- I do recall something about making sure we were drinking 24 25 water --38 1 Q. Okay. But what --2 -- before that. But the chant hydrate, hydrate, hydrate I only remember from the morning 3 4 of the sweat lodge. 5 Q. Okay. Let me phrase it differently, 6 then. 7 Α. Uh-huh. Q. Did Mr. Ray ask you to drink water from 8 the beginning of the seminar on? 10 Α. Up until we were told we couldn't have 11 any, yes. 12
- Q. Okay. So from the moment you arrived at Angel Valley at the retreat, Mr. Ray asked you to 13 drink water, whatever words he used, to ask you to 14 15 do that; correct? 16 A. I believe so. Q. Repeatedly; correct? 17 A. I couldn't say if it was repeatedly for 18 that period of time. 19 20 Now, just focussing for a second on just the tent and all of those things relating to the 21 22 sweat lodge. 23 If I could have Exhibit 145 up on the 24 projector -- which is in evidence. Ms. Gennari, you will recall that before 25

you went into ene sweat lodge, there were 1 Dream Team members and other volunteers stationed outside the sweat lodge? 3 A. I don't remember that. 4 5 Okay. Does this picture refresh your recollection that there were people stationed 6 7 outside the sweat lodge? A. I never saw the view looking like that. 8 I saw lots of people milling around with all of us there. I'm really not aware that there were 10 people, quote, unquote, stationed anywhere. 11 12 Q. Okay. 13 Α. I don't know. You wouldn't have any reason to believe 14 that there were not people stationed on the 15 outside -- Dream Team members? 16 No reason to believe they were or 17 Α. weren't. 18 19 Q. Okay. A. I have no recollection. 20 21 Q. Other than this photograph? 22 Α. Exactly. MR. LI: Sir, if we could look at Exhibit 146, 23 which is also in evidence. 24 25 So this is another photograph, which is

also in evidence. Do you recall seeing anything 2 like this?

3 Α.

Q. But you don't have any reason to believe 4 that this isn't an accurate depiction of what was 5

going on in the sweat lodge? 6

No.

7 A. I have no idea.

8 Now, there were buckets and hoses to cool

9 people off when they came out?

I know I was hit by water from a hose. I 10 didn't actually see those things. 11

So you were hit with water from a hose; 12 Q.

13 correct?

14

15

17

Α. That I could tell.

Q. So would you deduce that, then, there was

16 a hose?

> There was at least one hose. Α.

Okay. And then, secondly, I believe that 18 on direct examination you testified you were --19

some water was poured on you from a bucket as well? 20

Somebody poured water over me. It could 21 have been a bucket, a cooler. I don't know. 22

Q. Okay. Some sort of device that carries 23

24 water --

Something. Yes.

40

Q. -- like a bucket -you had testified on direct that 1 1 there were Dream Team members stationed at the four 2 2 Α. Could be. Q. cardinal -- I'm sorry -- corners of the sweat -- that might have been poured on you; 3 4 4 correct? Is that correct? lodge; correct? I don't know. Some sort of water 5 Α. 5 6 Q. Inside. And so Liz Neuman, for instance, 6 carrying device. Sure. 7 was seated between you and Laura Tucker? 7 Okay. And it, in fact, cooled you off; 8 Α. 8 correct? 9 If I could have Exhibit 414. Q. 9 Α. The water from the hose cooled me off. 10 And we've had this oriented many, many 10 The water from the bucket went up my nose and made different ways during the course of this trial. me almost stop breathing. 11 11 Let's just keep it this way for now. You were --12 Q. 12 The water up the nose --13 Α. Yes. 13 if you could just mark where you were. 14 Q. -- made you almost stop breathing? 14 I was about here. Q. And Ms. Neuman --15 15 That was very unpleasant. Α. She would have been --16 Q. Yeah. 16 Q. -- right at about the 9:00 o'clock Α. Yes. 17 17 position in this orientation? Q. I can imagine. But when you say "stop 18 18 19 Α. Yes. breathing," do you mean it almost killed you? 19 20 No. It went into my sinuses and was 20 Q. And there was another Dream Team member 21 at the 12:00 o'clock orientation? 21 extremely painful is what I mean. As I recall, people were told to go sit 22 22 Okay. So it was extraordinarily 23 in the north, east, and west. So I didn't see 23 unpleasant? 24 Α. 24 25 Q. So if you could mark what you mean by 25 Q. But did it stop you from breathing? 1 A. For the time water was going up my nose, 1 that. People were told to sit at these points. absolutely. 2 2 MR. LI: And for the record, Ms. Gennari 3 3 Q. Okay. I just want to make sure we're 4 marked the 12:00 o'clock position and the 4 talking about the same thing. So it was very 5 3:00 o'clock position. unpleasant. But it didn't almost kill you, did it? 5 A. 6 Q. And Mr. Ray was seated to the --6 No. depending on how you're looking at it, to the --7 7 Q. Okay. Now, outside of the sweat lodge 8 right about there; is that correct? 8 there was a recovery station. Do you remember 9 that? 9 Α. Yes. So there were people from the company 10 10 A. Q. 11 posted at each of the cardinal positions? 11 MR. LI: Ask that Exhibit 281, which is in Α. 12 Yes. 12 evidence. 13 Q. There was electrolytes and water. You 13 And prior to the sweat lodge, Mr. Ray had 14 suggested to you -- not to you, but to everybody 14 don't recall seeing that? Α. I never saw it. 15 that it would be a good idea to get close to the 15 16 16 When you were walking into the sweat ground; correct? Α. I don't recall. 17 lodge around the tent, did you not see it --17 Α. Q. In fact, he had said that you have to 18 18 I didn't see it -stay close to the ground where it's cooler? Q. -- off to your left? 19 19 20 Α. -- no. 20 Α. I don't recall. 21 Q. Okay. 21 Q. Okay. If there were a tape recording of

22 23

24

25

him saying that to the group, you wouldn't have any

reason to dispute the accuracy of that tape

recording, would you?

No.

there as well?

No.

If I could look at Exhibit 282.

And you didn't see the fruit that was

22

23

24

1 Q. All right. And you, in act -- and I'll 2 get back to this in a bit. You, in fact, did put 3 yourself close to the ground; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And you dug your fingers into the dirt;6 correct?

7 A. Yes.

Q. And it was cooler closer to the ground,

9 wasn't it?

8

10 A. In my first place.

11 Q. In your first position where you spent 12 approximately seven rounds, it was much cooler 13 there; correct?

14 A. Yes.

Q. And by "there," I mean close to the ground.

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Now, prior to the sweat lodge ceremony,

19 Mr. Ray also told you, so if you have to leave,

20 then you n1eed to leave; correct?

21 A. There was more to that. We were told to

22 leave between rounds.

Q. Yes. But just on the one question that Iasked you, did he say if you have to leave, then

25 you need to?

6

11

46

1 A. Between rounds.

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. It's not --

Q. I understand that. But if we could

5 just -- just answer the --

A. It's not accurate unless you --

7 Q. So if there's a --

8 THE REPORTER: One at a time, please.

9 MR. LI: I'm sorry.

10 Q. Go ahead.

A. It's not accurate unless you add that we

12 were supposed to leave only between rounds.

13 Q. Okay. Did he say if you have to leave,

14 then you need to? And you're right here. You

15 can't duck out this way. You have to go all the

16 way around and go out the lodge when the gates are

17 open. If you have to leave, you leave. And you

18 leave very, very -- in a controlled manner, very

19 carefully because there is legs and it's dark.

20 There is legs, there is knees, and there is elbows.

21 And -- you know -- the last thing we want is anyone

22 in the pit.

23 Do you remember him making that

24 statement?

25 A. It sounds familiar.

1 Q. You have no reason to dispute that that

2 was a statement that Mr. Ray made to the whole

3 group; correct?

A. No.

Q. And that's, in fact, what you did when

6 you left the lodge; correct?

7 A. Yes.

Q. You went out in a controlled manner?

9 A. As controlled as pure, blind panic can

10 be.

4

5

8

11

20

21

24

25

2

8

13

16

20

21

Q. Okay. You didn't rush for the door, did

12 you?

13 A. I rushed for the door in a clockwise.

14 Q. You were -- I did the math this weekend.

15 I tried to figure it out what A squared plus B

16 squared -- you know -- that equals C squared

17 equation. And if this is 23 feet, the whole thing,

18 then the diameter is about 12 feet, 11 and a half

19 feet; correct?

A. The radius?

Q. The radius. Yes. You're the math major.

22 Sorry. The radius is about 11 1/2 feet, give or

23 take?

A. Okay.

Q. And so then the radius going the other

1 way is also 11 1/2 feet, give or take?

A. Close enough. I think the pit was off

3 center a little.

4 Q. So then this what they call -- what is

5 it? -- the hypotenuse --

6 A. Uh-huh.

Q. -- is about 15 feet, give or take?

A. I can't do it in my head right this

9 second.

10 Q. Okay. Well, I tried to do it in my head,

11 and I had to get a calculator. It's about 15

12 feet -- would you agree with me? -- approximately.

A. I suppose.

14 Q. And so 15 feet is from about, say,

15 probably me to you?

A. Roughly.

17 Q. Okay. So instead of going those 15 feet

18 right out the door -- or probably even a little

19 less because you were closer; right?

A. A little bit.

Q. So instead of going those -- let's call

22 it 13 or 14 feet straight out the door, you went

23 all the way around; correct?

24 A. Yes.

Q. And that was in part because you were

- told to go out the door -- if you're going to go out the door, go out in a controlled manner
- 3 clockwise?
 - A. Yes.
- **Q.** Now, I want to talk to you quickly about
- 6 the Vision Quest. We had spent a little time
- 7 talking about it on Friday. And I wanted to -- I
- 8 had a chance to go back and look at the transcript
- 9 of your direct examination, and I wanted to ask you
- 10 a few questions about that.
- 11 On your direct examination you were
- 12 asked, how did you feel about the Vision Quest?
- 13 And do you remember replying, I got hungry? I got
- 14 dizzy? I got a headache? My body was just not
- 15 happy with no food?
- 16 Do you remember saying that?
- 17 A. Yes.
- **Q.** And then on cross-examination I asked you
- 19 some more questions about your experience in the
- 20 Vision Quest. Do you remember that?
- 21 A. Vaguely.
- **Q.** Okay. Well, I was asking you questions
- 23 and -- let me just ask you this: Did you know that
- 24 I was reading from an interview transcript that you
- 5 had done with Detective Willingham?
- 50
- 1 A. Yes. I remembered it about the third
- 2 time you read it.
- **Q.** Okay. So you were interviewed by
- 4 Detective Willingham from the Yavapai County
- 5 Sheriff's Office on October 27, 2009?
- 6 A. Probably. I can't verify the date. But
- 7 yes.
- **Q.** Okay.
- 9 A. I remember talking.
- 10 Q. And you understood that when a detective
- 11 calls you about a case, it's involving a criminal
- 12 investigation; correct?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And you knew it was important to give
- 15 that detective complete and full information;
- 16 correct?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Because, frankly, three people had passed
- 19 away and there was a criminal homicide
- 20 investigation going on; right?
 - A. Yes.
- **Q.** And you knew you had a duty to tell the
- 23 detective the truth, the whole truth, and nothing
- 24 but the truth?
- 25 A. As much as I could pull out of my brain

- 1 at that point, yes.
- 2 Q. And you knew that Detective Willingham
- 3 tape-recorded that statement?
- 4 A. Yes.

5

8

9

18

19

- Q. In fact, you have -- well, let me ask
- 6 you. Have you reviewed your statement a few times
- 7 before you came to court?
 - A. Quickly. Yes.
 - Q. How many times?
- 10 A. Probably twice.
- 11 **Q.** Twice?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Okay. During that interview on
- 14 October 27th that was tape-recorded, you did not
- 15 say to the detective that I got hungry. I got
- 16 dizzy. I got a headache. My body was just not
- 17 happy with no food. You did not say that?
 - A. I don't think so.
 - Q. You were asked about the Vision Quest?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. You were asked about what you ate and
- 22 drank?
- 23 A. I was asked what I ate and drank. Yes.
- MR. LI: I'd ask that we play Exhibit 644 at
- 25 2445 through 2627.
- 1 And for the state, this is at the
- 2 transcript, page 13, lines 2 through 24.
- 3 MS. POLK: Your Honor, this is not in
- 4 evidence.

5

- MR. LI: This is just impeachment, Your Honor.
- 6 THE COURT: And this is the statement you just
- 7 examined concerning --
- 8 MR. LI: Correct.
- 9 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 10 You may play that.
- 11 MR. LI: Thank you.
- MS. POLK: Counsel, could we have a page
- 13 number, please?
- MR. LI: Yes. It is page 13, lines 2 through
- **15** 24.

18

- 16 (Exhibit 644 played.)
- 17 MR. LI: Thank you.
 - Q. So you told detective -- that was you on
- 19 the tape, wasn't it?
- 20 A. Yes.
- **Q.** Okay. You told Detective Willingham that
- 22 you had read the release -- that form that
- 23 described the events?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. You told her that it was an opportunity

Q.

Modern Magick?

And let me ask you this: You decide for

24

25

Α.

Okay. And then on cross-examination you

told me that you had not said that?

Yes.

Α.

Q.

when they got up on the mic?

That he'd yell at people?

23

1

Q. Okay.

1

2

5

8

18

21

25

5

Α. And that's what I'd like to clarify.

3 Okay. And I will absolutely promise you

4 in a couple of questions you can have at it. Okay?

So on cross-examination you told me that

you had not said that you -- not said that;

7 correct? Let me rephrase that.

On cross-examination I asked you if you

9 got up and spoke.

10 Α. Yes.

Q. 11 Do you remember that?

A. That is what you asked me. 12

13 Q. And on -- and your answer was that you

14 had not -- that you did. I'm totally messing this

15 up. Okay. So let me start again.

A. I'm confused. 16

17 Q. Let me start from the top.

Okay. On direct examination Ms. Polk

19 asked you, did you ever get up and speak? And you

20 answered no. Do you remember that?

Α. Yes.

22 Q. On cross-examination I asked you, did you

23 get up and speak on the open mic? And you said

24 that you had.

> Α. Yes. And that's what I'd like to

> > 62

clarify. 1

2 Q. Okay. So you would agree with me that

those are two different ideas; correct? 3

4 And I realized that because the rest of

the story in my head had not come out my mouth,

that is confusing. 6

7 Okay. But you would agree with me these

8 are two separate --

Α. 9 What came out --

10 Q. -- statements?

11 Α. -- was two separate statements.

12 Q. Okay.

Α. 13 Yes.

Q. 14 And please tell us what the explanation

15 is.

21

16 When we had been talking about people

17 getting -- standing up and being shot down, the

18 picture in my head was of previous events, large

19 hotel ballrooms, hundreds of people, somebody

20 standing up to ask a question and being shot down. And from that picture in my head, I said, no. I

22 never did that. Because in a hundred people -- you

23 know, five-, 600-people ballroom, no. Not in a

24 million years. And those are all lumped together

in one bucket in my head. 25

Spiritual Warrior, which was about, I

don't know, 50, 60 people in a small room that felt 2

more like summer camp where we sat down with the 3

microphone. To me that was a completely -- still 4

difficult for me. But it wasn't the insurmountable 5

obstacle that standing up in front of hundreds of 6

7 people was then.

So I answered the first question from the 8

first bucket in my head of large ballrooms. And 9

no. I wouldn't do that. But at Spiritual Warrior 10

when we were a much more intimate group and 11

smaller, then I actually did push myself to take 12

the mic because I was so confused by the result of 13

that exercise. But make no mistake, I remained 14

seated. 15

> Okay. I think I understand now. We had Q.

17 a bit --

16

18

25

3

5

14

20

21

23

24

They were different in my head. And so I

answered from different places. And I'm glad you 19

brought it up because it occurred to me over the 20

weekend that those were not clear with my words as 21

they were in my head. 22

23 Q. Okay. So we had a miscommunication,

24 basically?

> Α. Yes.

1 And so you did, in fact, pick up the mic

at Spiritual Warrior --2

> Α. Yes.

4 Q. -- and speak?

> Α. Yes.

Q. 6 Now, you did that voluntarily; correct?

Yes. 7 Α.

Q. Nobody forced you? 8

A. 9 No.

10 Let's go back to your characterization as

Mr. Ray as a tyrant and a bully. Is it your 11

12 testimony that Mr. Ray was abusive to the

13 participants, including you?

> Α. At times.

Now, let's go back to your interview on 15 Q.

16 October 27, 2009, with Detective Willingham. You

17 did not say that Mr. Ray was a bully and a tyrant

or that he was abusive to the participants then, 18

19 did you?

> A. I don't believe we talked about it.

Well, in fact, you described him in quite

22 affectionate terms almost?

> I don't recall. This has been quite the journey of figuring out a lot of things in my head in the last year and a half.

1

2

5

11

22

2

66

MR. LI: I'd like to play Exmit 644 at 5712 1 2 through 35.

3 And the page number, Ms. Polk, is 4 page 28.

(Exhibit 644 played.)

6 MS. POLK: Pursuant to 106, I would ask that 7 the context be provided.

8 MR. LI: Your Honor, the only issue is whether 9 or not she described Mr. Ray in positive terms and 10 that -- did not call him a bully or a tyrant. And 11 this is only impeachment. If the state believes

that it has an evidentiary basis to play anything 12

else, they can do that on redirect. 13

14 THE COURT: Ms. Polk, 613(b) will be followed.

And that does allow for an explanation if that's 15

16 part of it. So if that's appropriate as

17 explanation, 613(b) would permit that on redirect.

MS. POLK: Thank you. 18

19 Q. BY MR. LI: Now, in that interview you did not say Mr. Ray was a tyrant and a bully, did 20 21 you?

A. 22 No.

5

23 Q. You did not say he was abusive to the 24 participants, did you?

25 Α. No.

1 Q. In fact, you said that he needed to get over himself? 2

A. Yes.

3

4 Q. You said that as you were listening, you 5 would hear great information, great information.

Oh, come on, dude. Get over yourself. 6

7 A. Yes.

Q. And then you said great information, 8 great information. Oh, yeah. Get over yourself. 9

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. So, in other words, there was some information that was great. And sometimes when 12 13 you're sitting in the seminars that you thought Mr. Ray needed to get over himself? 14

A. Yes. At the time.

Q. Understood. At the time. And you said 16 17 that it was like having a big dog that comes over 18 and slobbers on you; correct?

At the time that's how I characterized 19

20 it.

15

Q. Okay. And you would agree with me, would 21 you not, that a big dog that comes over and slobbers on you is not the same thing as a tyrant 23

24 or an abusive bully; correct?

25 Α. Correct. Q. It's just a big, sloppy dog?

Α.

And you said that you would put up with 3 this because he is a nice big dog; correct? 4

At the time that's what I thought.

Okay. You did not say that you would put up with a big, abusive, tyrannical, bully dog, did 7 8 you?

Nobody wants to believe that of 9 Α. themselves. 10

Q. But you didn't say that, did you?

A. I did not. No. 12

Q. And just so we're clear, then, on 13

October 27, 2009, when you're speaking to a 14

detective from the Yavapai County Sheriff's Office, 15

you didn't accuse Mr. Ray of mind control or 16

17 something like that, did you?

A. I don't -- I don't recall the entire 18 conversation. 19

20 Q. Okay. And you didn't accuse him of being 21 abusive and bullying, did you?

A. I don't think so.

23 Q. Okay. Fair to say that, basically, as 24 you sit here today, you think that all of Mr. Ray's 25

material is, at least for you, useless?

1 Α. Mostly.

Q. And, basically, not your cup of tea?

3 Α. Pretty much.

Now, I'm going to talk a little bit more 4

about Friday's testimony. On Friday you testified 5

that you were impacted and unable to make your own 6

decisions because of the breathwork. Do you 7

remember that? 8

9 A. Well, because of a number of factors, the 10 breathwork being one.

Q. The breathwork being one of them. And 11 this is when you lie down and breathe really fast 12 and you, basically, hyperventilate? 13

14 Α.

Q. And it makes you dizzy? 15

16 Α. Yes.

19

24

Q. Were you deprived of rational thought by 17 the fact that you were dizzy? 18

Α. Somewhat.

Q. Okay. Now, isn't it the case that you 20 told Detective Willingham about this breathwork 21 22 exactly that anything happened, all I had to do was stop doing it and I'd float back to normal. 23

Do you remember saying that?

25 Yes.

Page 65 to 68 of 275 17 of 69 sheets

- Q. And that was true; correct?
- 2 A. That was what I thought.
- 3 Q. That if anything was happening that you
- 4 didn't like, all you had to do was stop doing it
- 5 and you'd float back to normal?
- 6 A. That was what I believed. Yes.
- **Q.** With respect to the breathwork?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Okay. Now, we also talked about
- 10 meditation.

1

- 11 A. Uh-huh.
- **Q.** And you also suggested up to us on Friday
- 13 that the two-hour sessions of meditation, as
- 14 opposed to the one-hour sessions, impacted you and
- 15 made you unable to make your own decisions.
- 16 Do you recall that testimony?
- 17 A. It made me a little dizzy. Yes.
- 18 Q. Okay. It made you spacey?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. And did Mr. Ray force you to meditate?
- 21 A. It was part of the program.
- 22 Q. Okay. I'm going to --
- 23 A. I'm going to go back to at the time I was
- 24 following my instructions for the program.
- **Q.** Were you forced to meditate?
- 70
- 1 A. Again, that's very complicated. I don't
- 2 feel like I was -- I don't feel like I -- how do I
- 3 explain this?
- 4 I was there to follow the program. I
- 5 paid enormous piles of money to be there. I was
- 6 trying to get as much as possible out of it. And,
- 7 therefore, I participated in everything that was
- 8 presented.
- 9 Q. Okay. Fair enough. But Mr. Ray did not
- 10 force you to meditate, did he?
- 11 A. He put it in the program, and that was my
- 12 mind-set. Follow the program.
- 13 Q. Okay. Well, let me flip it around, then.
- 14 So is it your testimony that because Mr. Ray put it
- 15 in the program, he forced you to meditate?
- 16 A. I just don't think that's the right word.
- 17 Q. "Forced" is not the right word?
- 18 A. In either direction.
- 19 Q. Now, you did not tell
- 20 Detective Willingham on October 27 that you had
- 21 been forced to meditate, did you?
- 22 A. I don't know.
- 23 Q. And, in fact, what you told her was right
- 24 after you discussed the breathwork, you said, and
- 25 the same thing with meditating, it was like, no.

- 1 This is getting too weird. And all I'd have to do
- 2 is open my eyes and look around the room and I'd be
- 3 back to myself.

4

5

9

12

19

- Do you remember saying that?
 - A. I don't recall. But I could have.
- Q. Would it refresh your recollection to
- 7 look at a transcript of your statement to
- 8 Detective Willingham?
 - A. Sure.
- 10 Q. This is page 17, lines 7 through 9. And
- 11 just read it to yourself.
 - A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Now, do you recall saying to
- 14 Detective Willingham, and the same with meditating?
- 15 It was like, no? This is getting too weird? And
- 16 all I'd have to do is open my eyes and look around
- 17 the room and I'd be back to myself? Again, do you
- 18 remember saying that?
 - A. Yes.
- 20 Q. And that was, in fact, true, wasn't it?
- 21 All you had to do was open up your eyes and stop
- 22 meditating?
- 23 A. What I had to do was open up my eyes to
- 24 get from weird to something I could deal with.
 - Q. Okay. And stop meditating, basically;

25

5

- 1 correct?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. You could just open up your eyes and stop
- 4 meditating?
 - A. Yes.
- **Q.** We discussed the vegetarian diet on
- 7 Friday. You suggested that the vegetarian diet
- 8 somehow impacted your ability to make decisions.
- 9 Do you recall that?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. So let's -- I mean -- you know -- I won't
- 12 spend too much time on this. But breakfast,
- 13 basically, they had a buffet; correct?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. It had oatmeal?
- 16 A. Yes.
- **17 Q.** Eggs?
- 18 A. Yes.
- **19 Q.** I just want to make sure. Eggs?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Like, scrambled eggs --
- 22 A. Yes.
 - Q. -- like, in a warming pan?
 - A. Yes. That was our one solid meal.
 - Q. Yeah. And bread?

23

24

A. Yes. 1 2 Q. Fruit? Α. 3 I don't remember. Q. Okay. No bacon or sausage? Α. 5 Q. 6 And for lunch you had cheese, bread, 7 fruit, salad, and maybe a casserole? 8 Α. I don't remember. 9 Q. Just no ham sandwiches? Α. No. 10 Q. And dinner you had eggplant casserole, 11 bean chili, salads, fruit, bread, cheese? 12 13 Α. Yes. 14 Q. So -- you know --15 I don't remember cheese. 16 Q. Okay. But --17 A. I had the green tea. Q. A big bean casserole; right? 18 There were lots of beans and legumes and 19 things I don't normally eat. 20 21 Q. Okay. No steak, though? 22 Α. No. 23 And you did not tell Detective Willingham on October 27 that this diet of oatmeal, eggs, 24 25 bread, fruit, salad, casseroles, what have you, had 74 rendered you unable to make decisions for yourself, 2 did you? 3 A. I don't believe so. 4 Q. And the entire time you spent on this vegetarian diet was probably what? Four days, give 5 or take, three days? 6 7 A. Let's see. We got there -- I don't know. The days before the Vision Quest and then the days 8 9 after. 10 Q. Okay. You told us on Friday that you did not drink enough water because you were afraid to 11 12 have to go to the bathroom during classes. Do you 13 recall saying that? 14 A. Yes. And specifically you told us that before 15 Q. 16 the sweat lodge, you didn't drink enough water? 17 Α. I don't think I did. 18 Q. But you did talk about food and water with Detective Willingham on October 27, 2009, did 19 20 you not? A. Yes. 21 22 Q. And you told her that you drank water all

morning because we kept getting admonished to

hydrate, hydrate, hydrate?

Yes.

Do you remember saying that? 1 2 I drank water over the course of the morning. I was always careful that it wasn't 3 enough that I was running to the bathroom 4 5 constantly. 6 Q. Okay. 7 A. I was trying to balance that. MR. LI: Your Honor, I'm going to play 8 Exhibit 644, line 23 -- or time stamp 2338. 9 10 Ms. Polk, it's at page 12, lines 26 -sorry. Page 12, lines 14 through 27. 11 12 MS. POLK: Thank you. 13 Your Honor, the state objects to the 14 showing of the screen. MR. LI: Oh. 15 THE COURT: Yes. 16 MR. LI: Yes. And you understand that that 17 weird sort of thing comes --18 19 (Exhibit 644 played.) Q. BY MR. LI: So you had been admonished, 20 21 you kept on getting admonished, to hydrate, 22 hydrate, hydrate? 23 Α. That morning, yes. Okay. And is it your testimony that 24 25 Mr. Ray didn't say throughout the seminar to 1 hydrate, hydrate, hydrate? 2 I don't know. Like I said, I only

remember that particular little chant from that 3 morning. 4

Now, I'm not going to spend -- you 5 Q. know -- more than a few seconds on the Samurai

Game. You did mention it in that clip? 7

> Α. Yes.

9 Q. And you called it "silly"?

10 Α.

8

16

17

18

21

23

25

You on direct examination described it as Q. 11

getting ugly? 12

13 Α.

14 Q. And that there were verbal fights about

15 who won?

> Α. Yes.

Q. And that there was a particular ninja who stared at somebody, and he thought that that person

should have died because he stared at him? 19

20 Α.

> Q. Was that Lou Caci was the ninja?

22 Α. I don't know.

> Q. Was he sort of a -- about six-foot tall,

dark hair, and glasses? 24

They all looked the same once they took

76

23

- 1 off their hair.
- 2 Q. Okay. But he was a --
- 3 A. He was a guy. That's about the best I
- 4 can do.
- **Q.** Okay. Now, about the Vision Quest. And
- 6 I won't spend much time on this. I asked you on
- 7 Friday if you had been forced to write in your
- 8 journal. Do you remember that?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And you said that you couldn't at night
- 11 because it was dark.
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And you said you, basically, didn't
- 14 journal because you just got into your sleeping bag
- 15 and went to sleep?
- 16 A. Well, yeah. I got in my sleeping bag. I
- 17 watched the stars. I thought. I sat there -- you
- 18 know -- and watched the moon rise and then finally
- 19 went to sleep.
- **Q.** Okay. And that was on the first night?
- 21 A. No. That was the second night.
- 22 Q. The second night. So you had two nights
- 23 out in the dessert in a sleeping bag --
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. -- where you could have gone to sleep if
- 78

- you wanted to?
- 2 A. Yes.
- **Q.** And fair to say that you went to bed when
- 4 the sun was down, basically?
- 5 A. I climbed into my sleeping bag when the
- 6 sun was down. It was too cold not to.
- 7 Q. And then you could have closed your eyes
- 8 at that point if you wanted to?
- 9 A. Yeah. As I recall, that second night
- 10 when I climbed in, it was way too early for me to
- 11 actually go to sleep. So I just sort of -- you
- 12 know -- watched the lights and watched the stars
- 13 and watched the moon and --
- **Q.** It was too early to go to sleep because
- 15 it's, like, what? 7:00 or 8:00 o'clock at night?
- 16 A. Something like that.
- 17 Q. So you're going to bed at --
- 18 A. Exactly.
- 19 Q. -- 8:00 o'clock at night. And then at
- 20 some point you go to sleep; right?
 - A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And then you wake up the next morning at
- 23 what? Dawn?

- 24 A. Well, you wake up every time your body
- 25 figures out the ground is too hard lying on it, and

- then you wake up and wake up and wake up and wake
- 2 up. And then you wake up at dawn.
- 3 Q. Yeah.
- 4 A. Yeah.
- 5 Q. Have you gone camping before?
- 6 A. Yeah.
- 7 Q. And so we used to call it the 360. You'd
- 8 sleep on your back and then you'd sleep on your
- 9 side and sleep on your stomach and sleep on your
- 10 side and you sleep on your back again.
- 11 A. Pretty much. I wouldn't have given --
- 12 Q. Yeah. But, basically, it's like camping;
- 13 right?

17

18

4

5

8

- 14 A. Uh-huh.
- 15 Q. And yeah. It's not the same as sleeping
- 16 in a hotel bed with a down comforter?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. But you're sleeping; correct?
- 19 A. Yeah.
- 20 Q. And that's two nights in a row?
- 21 A. Yes
- 22 Q. Now, participants were -- and you chose
- 23 to do all of those activities that I described;
- 24 correct?
- 25 A. We can replay this game. I was
- 1 participating in everything I was given.
- 2 Q. Okay. And you put one foot in front of
- 3 the other; correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And you did not go to the parking lot,
- 6 get in the car, and leave, did you?
- 7 A. No
 - Q. You didn't call and get a cab back to
- 9 the -- Sedona, did you?
- 10 A. Obviously not.
- 11 Q. You didn't get on a plane and go back to
- 12 Redwood City, did you?
- 13 A. Obviously not.
- 14 Q. Okay. Now, participants were asked to
- 15 make choices all week; correct? Cut your hair or
- 16 don't cut your hair --
 - A. All right.
- 18 Q. -- correct?
- A. That was one.
- 20 Q. What issues you wanted to work on, that
- 21 was up to the participants to decide; correct?
- 22 A. Within boundaries.
- 23 Q. Right. It's like -- you know -- we'll do
- 24 this again?
- 25 A. Yeah.

- 1 Q. It's like when you're in college.
- 2 Somebody tells you you need to write -- or high
- 3 school or whatever. You need to write about Huck
- 4 Finn or something like that. And you, as the
- 5 student, can write whatever you want about Huck
- 6 Finn; correct?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. And that's what you mean by --
- 9 A. Yeah.
- 10 Q. -- within --
- 11 A. That's what I mean within boundaries.
- 12 Q. -- within boundaries; right?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And you guys, you participants, chose who
- 15 your team leaders would be?
- 16 A. I don't recall how that person --
- 17 Q. For instance, the domeo, the head of the
- 18 various samurai clans.
- 19 A. I don't recall how that person was
- 20 chosen.
- 21 Q. And some folks actually chose not to
- 22 participate in the exercises; correct?
- 23 A. I don't know.
- 24 Q. You didn't cut your hair?
- A. I did not.
 - Q. And Dr. Soheyla Marzvaan and her sister
- 2 left the seminar; correct?
- 3 A. I didn't find that out until after I got
- 4 home.
- 5 Q. Okay. And Elsa Hefstad chose not to
- 6 participate in the sweat lodge ceremony; correct?
- 7 A. I found that out afterwards too.
- 8 Q. So people exercised choice not to
- 9 participate; correct?
- 10 A. They did.
- 11 Q. Now, let's talk about the sweat lodge for
- 12 a few minutes. And this is about choice. The girl
- 13 next to you, not Liz, but a Hispanic lady --
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. -- she was sort of whimpering during the
- 16 ceremony?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. She said, I hate it. I don't like this.
- 19 I don't like this. Do you remember that?
- 20 A. Yes.

21

- **Q.** And the people around her said, you can
- 22 do it? You can do it? You're more than this?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. And you exercised choice to say, do
- 25 what's right for you.

- 1 A. Mostly I wanted her to go away. I found 2 her whimpering irritating.
- 3 Q. Okay. You found her whimpering
- 4 irritating.
- 5 A. I would like to think I was a better
- 6 person and was really out for -- you know -- what
- 7 she should do for herself. But at the moment it
- 8 was just driving me nuts.
- 9 Q. Okay. And you found her whimpering
- 10 irritating?

11

12

21

24

2

5

8

- A. Yes.
 - Q. So you said, do what's right for you?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And she chose to leave.
- 15 A. At some point she vanished. So I guess
- 16 she did.
- 17 Q. Okay. And others chose to leave during
- 18 the course of the ceremony?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. And you knew you could leave at any time?
 - A. Between rounds.
- 22 Q. Yeah. But between the rounds you knew
- 23 you could leave?
 - A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And many people chose to leave at various
- 1 times during the ceremony?
 - A. Yes.
- 3 Q. At one point there was a -- I think you
- 4 called it a "kerfuffle," about a flashlight?
 - A. Yes.
- **Q.** And what you found out is somebody
- 7 scooted out the back of the tent; correct?
 - A. I found that out much later.
- **9** Q. But somebody chose to scoot out the back
- 10 of the tent?
- 11 A. Yeah. I found that out from the news
- 12 media.
- 13 Q. Now, you actually described this to
- 14 Detective Willingham as going to a sports camp
- 15 where everyone is cheering you on. Do you remember
- **16** that?

17

18

21

24

- A. Yes.
- Q. And saying like -- you know -- like in
- 19 the sports camp where all the participants are
- 20 saying you can do it. You can do it; correct?
 - A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And that's how you described it to
- 23 Detective Willingham on December 27, 2009?
 - A. Probably.
 - Q. Would it refresh your -- do you want me

1

5

7

8

13

17

21

25

1

2

4

5

9

14

17

20

23

A. If it's in there, I believe it. I don't recall our conversation word for word.

Q. Mr. Ray. He didn't shove you into the sweat lodge, did he?

A. No.

1

2

3

6

7 Q. He didn't physically keep you from

8 leaving, did he?9 A. Not physically.

10 Q. He didn't grab you?

11 A. No.

12 Q. I know you said he bellowed at you.

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. But he didn't physically restrain you,

15 did he?

16 A. Not physically.

17 Q. And when he said -- at the end of the18 ceremony when you were about to leave, he didn't19 touch you, did he?

20 A. No.

21 Q. He didn't say he was going to tackle you

22 if you tried to leave, did he?

23 A. No.

24 Q. He didn't say he was going to wrestle

25 with you if you tried to leave?

A. No.

Q. He never said he'd hit you or anything

3 like that if you left?

4 A. No.

Q. He didn't say that to anybody else, did

6 he?

1

5

8

15

18

7 A. Not that I know of.

Q. He didn't -- well, you didn't hear him

9 say, I'm going to hit you --

10 A. No.

11 Q. -- if you try to leave?

12 A. No.

13 Q. He didn't say, I'm going to grab you and

14 tackle you if you try to leave?

A. No.

Q. So if somebody said that he physically

17 restrained you from leaving, that would be untrue?

A. He didn't have to.

19 Q. Well, I -- let me just -- I understand

20 what you're position is. But I just want to --

21 A. Not physically. I was not physically 22 touched.

Q. Okay. So if somebody said that hephysically restrained you from leaving, that would

25 be untrue?

A. Yes

Q. If somebody said that you witnessed him
physically restraining somebody, keeping somebody
from leaving, that would also be untrue?

MS. POLK: Objection, Judge. Argumentative.

6 THE COURT: Overruled.

You may answer that.

THE WITNESS: What was it? Sorry.

Q. BY MR. LI: No. That's all right. If

10 somebody said that you witnessed somebody -- that

11 you witnessed Mr. Ray physically restraining

12 someone else from leaving, that would be untrue?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, have you ever claimed that when you
tried to leave the sweat lodge, Mr. Ray blocked
your passage with threats of offensive touching?

A. No.

18 Q. Have you ever said -- have you ever 19 claimed that you witnessed Mr. Ray or -- do so to 20 other participants?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever claimed that when youwanted to leave the sweat lodge, Mr. Ray physically

24 touched you in an offensive way thereby causing you

injuries and extreme emotional distress?

86

A. No.

Q. Have you ever claimed that Mr. Ray

3 somehow deprived you of rational thought?

A. I didn't know that until much later.

Q. Okay. But have you ever claimed that?

6 A. Claimed it in what?

7 Q. Have you ever claimed that Mr. Ray

8 somehow deprived you of rational thought?

A. In what context would I be making this

10 claim?

11 Q. Let me move on. I'll ask you another

12 question. Have you ever claimed that you were

13 forced into the sweat lodge?

A. No.

Q. Because, in fact, you had not been forced

16 into the sweat lodge?

A. We walked in.

Q. And if somebody said that you had been

19 forced into the sweat lodge, that would be untrue?

A. True.

21 Q. Now, when we talked on Friday, you told

22 us you were working for a company; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And you said that that company was goingout of business?

Page 85 to 88 of 275

A. Probably.

1

2

5

9

18

21

24

1

2

6

12

14

15

21

Q. Okay. Now, how long have you known that?

3 Α. Since about three weeks after the sweat lodge. 4

Q. About three weeks after the sweat lodge.

And just so we're clear, Mr. Ray doesn't have

anything to do with the economics of that 7

particular company that you're working for?

Α.

10 Q. True or false? September 2009, about

11 months after your tape-recorded interview with 11

12 Detective Willingham, you filed a lawsuit against

13 JRI, the company?

14 A. September 2009? Wasn't the sweat lodge

15 in October of '09?

16 Q. Did you file a lawsuit against the

17 company?

A. Yes.

Q. 19 Is the case number

20 37-2010-00060108-CU-PO-NC?

A. I have no idea.

22 Q. Is your lawyer Robert Bohn from San Jose,

23 California?

> Α. Yes.

25 Q. Did you review the lawsuit before it was eedings continued outside presence

2 of jury.)

1

6

20

21

23

24

4

90

witnesses.

3 THE COURT: Ms. Polk.

MS. POLK: Your Honor, several issues. First 4 of all, pursuant to 15.1, there has been no 5 disclosure to the state. That rule makes it clear

that any evidence the party intends to use must be 7

provided to the other side. There has been no 8

disclosure of this lawsuit. 9

10 Secondly, the parties with the Court had discussed this issue of the lawsuit and whether it 11 would be relevant. And at the time, the defense 12 had indicated to the state that they did not intend 13 to ask the witness we were discussing about the 14 lawsuit. And the state believed, perhaps wrongly, 15 that the defense would provide notice to the state 16 and notice to the Court with an opportunity to 17 argue all the issues and resolve all the issues 18 surrounding the filing of the lawsuit by any of the 19

The state had no notice. The court, I believe, has had no notice. And there are issues concerning if a lawsuit is introduced, then what can the parties do next? That issue has not been

resolved. Mr. Li has now opened that door.

25

filed?

Α. Parts of it.

3 Q. So I just want to make it so we're 4 absolutely cleared. Okay. You filed a lawsuit

5 against JRI, the company; correct?

A. Yes.

7 Did you review the whole thing before you

8 filed it, or did you just file it without caring

9 what's in it?

10 Α. I went through as much as I could stand

to read. 11

Q. Okay. It's about eight or nine pages,

13 give or take?

A. Yeah.

MS. POLK: Your Honor, may we approach?

16 THE COURT: Yes.

17 Ladies and gentlemen -- well, why don't

we take the morning recess a little bit early. 18

19 So, ladies and gentlemen, please remember

20 the admonition.

The witness, of course, will remember the

22 rule of exclusion.

23 And please be ready to come back in at a

24 quarter till, about 25 minutes.

Thank you. 23 of 69 sheets

The state does not have a copy of this 1

lawsuit. We do not know the status of the lawsuit, 2

whether it's been resolved or not. I can obviously 3 find out from the witness. I don't know whether or

not there is a confidentiality agreement, what this 5

witness can talk to you -- can talk about or 6

testify about. 7

8 But, again, Your Honor, these were all

9 issues that outside the presence of the jury, the

parties were discussing with the Court. None of 10

it's been resolved. No notice to the state that 11

the defense intended to ask this witness about the 12

lawsuit and no notice to the Court. And here we 13

14

15 MR. LI: Your Honor, first of all, we don't have any obligation to disclose anything because 16

17 we're not actually introducing it into evidence.

18 We did talk about this issue about

whether or not a lawsuit -- existence of a lawsuit 19

is admissible or is relevant in discussing bias and 20

21 motive. We believe it is relevant with respect to

this witness who has testified one way on tape 22

23 right after the incident and sues, and now her

testimony is quite different. We are allowed to 24

impeach her about this. 25

Page 89 to 92 of 275

Moreover -- you know -- just on the sort 2 of disclosure issue, Your Honor, we had a long conversation about this several weeks ago. It is the state's obligation to find Brady. And the fact that a witness has a bias is Brady. And it is not the defense's obligation to find Brady. We do so because we're diligent. 7

8 But if I were the state and I were going 9 to call a witness, I would want to know, hey. Have you filed -- particularly in a case like this, hey. 10 11 Have you filed a lawsuit? What have you said in the lawsuit? Do you want money? These are all 12 issues that go directly to the credibility of the 13 14 witness and that are all -- those responsibilities 15 about finding out those issues and disclosing them 16 to the defense are all duties that fall squarely on 17 the state.

THE COURT: Ms. Polk.

18

19 MS. POLK: Your Honor, yes. In response, 20 first of all, it's not the state's obligation to go find Brady. The state's Brady obligation is to 21 22 provide to the opposing party all information that 23 is in our possession or our control.

24 These lawsuits are not in the state's 25 possession or control. We don't know about them.

24

10

94

The defendant knows about them because he's a party

to them. And so the statement to the Court that

it's the state's obligation to go find Brady and 3

disclose it is simply false. Our obligation is to 4

5 disclose what is in our possession or control.

Rule 15.1 -- I'm sorry -- 15.2(c)(3) says 6

7 that the defendant shall provide to the state a

list of all papers, documents, photographs, and 8

9 other tangible objects that the defendant intends

to use at trial. There is no exception there for 10

public records, for example. If the defendant 11

intends to use it at trial, they have to provide it 12

13 to the state.

14

15

16

17

18

25

Mr. Li is reading from a document. He's obviously reading from a document. And that's the same thing as using it at trial. Whether or not he marks it as an exhibit is an additional step that he may or may not take. Anything he is reading from that he is, by definition, using it, and it

19 20 falls within this disclosure obligation.

21 Your Honor, the state -- when we argued 22 to discuss this issue of a lawsuit with respect to Mr. Mehravar, who was the previous witness, the 23 24 state agreed that the existence of a lawsuit, the

fact of a lawsuit, is fair game, and it goes to

1 motive or bia

Then there is additional issues. The 2 complaint itself is hearsay, clearly hearsay. It's 3 an out-of-court statement that the defense, at 4 least with respect to Mr. Mehravar, intended to 5 introduce because they wanted to try to prove to the jury that there is other issues such as toxins, 7 there is other liability issues for Angel Valley, 8 all sorts of issues that obviously are not settled 9 by a lawsuit but are language that are used in that 10 11 lawsuit.

12 The complaint is hearsay. To be reading 13 the complaint in the language of the complaint to this witness is hearsay and should not be allowed. 14 I agree that the fact of the lawsuit, and she has 15 admitted it, goes to motive or bias, and then the 16 inquiry stops there. 17

Although it's the state's position that 18 if these lawsuits have been settled, if Mr. Ray or 19 20 his insurance company have paid money to these witnesses, that information should be allowed as 21 well because that to me is an admission of guilt by 22 Mr. Ray if he's settling these lawsuits. 23

And I think Mr. Li has now opened that door and the state should be allowed to ask the 25

witness has this lawsuit been settled? And did

2 Mr. Ray pay money to you in order to make this

lawsuit settle? It also negates the suggestion 3

that this witness now has a motive to lie because 4

her lawsuit has settled. 5

It's a very different scenario if there 6 is a pending lawsuit and she stands to gain or in 7 some way is concerned about the impact of her 8 9 testimony on a pending lawsuit.

believe that it has. Although I've not received 11 any disclosure from the defense. But if this 12 lawsuit is settled, then any motive to tailor her 13 testimony in such a way is now gone. Her testimony 14 cannot impact something that has settled, has been 15 16 resolved, and has gone away.

If this lawsuit has settled -- and I

THE COURT: With regard to the hearsay point, 17 Ms. Polk, if you recall from the Hernandez case, 18 the document there was a governmental claim 19 submitted under Title 12. And the majority of the 20 Supreme Court said that that's impeachment and 21 22 that's outside of 408. I think that might be what Mr. Li is looking at right now. I don't know. 23 24

But that was a governmental claim letter. And, as I recall, the majority indicated the

24 of 69 sheets

5

25

98

concern that if people are going to be asserting claims, it should be a truthful statement, and it can be used for impeachment. 3

There was a dissent in that case, and I think it was a dissent based primarily on 408.

But this is a complaint. It's not a governmental claim letter. So there is that distinction with the Hernandez case. But doesn't Hernandez really address the concern with hearsay when something is being used for impeachment?

I think it's the Hernandez case. Isn't 12 that the one.

13 MR. LI: I believe so, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Okay.

4

6

7

9

10

11

15

17

18

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

MS. POLK: And, Your Honor, on the issue of hearsay, to be an exception to the hearsay rule, it 16 is -- or nonhearsay, it is an admission by a party opponent. This person, unlike Hernandez, is not a party to this proceeding.

20 THE COURT: But if it goes to bias, you're --21 okay. It's not, strictly speaking -- well, that's the question. In Hernandez I don't know if the 22 23 person signed the governmental claim letter, for

example, in that case. I don't think it's 24

discussed. I don't know if the complaint was 25

signed in this which would give it some additional indicia of being adopted.

MS. POLK: And, Your Honor, again, in looking at Rule 801, a party or that party's agent, such as the lawyer, can make a statement that the party therefore adopts.

But, again, the operative question is, is that person a party to the lawsuit. Because then it's an admission by a party opponent. In this case, Ms. Gennari is not a party to this proceeding, and so clearly it is hearsay.

Additionally, again, there has been no disclosure to the state. I don't know what the 13 record is that Mr. Li is reading from. If it's a 14 complaint, has it been signed? Is it a verified complaint? We don't know any of that because there has been no disclosure and we don't have it. 17

But I would just emphasize, again, two questions. One is the existence of a lawsuit. And I do believe that's relevant. And Mr. Li has established that.

The second is the complaint itself or reading from a document which is clearly hearsay. 23 24 Mr. Gennari is not a party opponent, as Hernandez or the Hernandez's attorney was, and, therefore, is

a party made or a statement made by an agent. 1

She's simply not a party and so not an exception

under the hearsay rule. 3

MR. LI: Your Honor, if I may?

THE COURT: Yes.

6 MR. LI: There are many, many different responses to Ms. Polk's argument, which I'll sum up 7 with I think she has the evidence code wrong. 8

First of all, this is not being -- all I 9 need is a good-faith basis to ask. And that's all 10

I've done. And, in fact, just for the record, what 11

I'm reading from is my cross-examination outline. 12

And we are not introducing any evidence. So we're 13 not seeking to introduce, quote/unquote, hearsay. 14

What we are doing is we're impeaching a witness 15

with prior inconsistent statements and 16

demonstrating motive and bias under Rule 613. 17

18 The issue that Ms. Polk stepped into, which would literally result in reversible error 19 the moment she asks the question, is -- relates to 20 21 Rule 408, which governs the admissibility or

nonadmissibility of any settlement or settlement 22

offers. And it is explicitly not permissible to go 23

into that under Rule 408. 24

I mean, it just says, prohibited -- you

know -- 408(a). Prohibited use, evidence of the

following -- and this is settlement -- is not 2

admissible on behalf of any party when offered to 3

prove liability. So it would literally be

reversible error on -- the moment she opened her 5

mouth to ask about that question. 6

And, Your Honor, just for the record, the 7 case hasn't settled. So the condition precedents 8 that Ms. Polk believes matters that -- you know --9 she, in fact, doesn't have a motive to lie or to 10 change her story just doesn't exist. She has an

11 active case, and she has an economic interest in 12

the outcome of this particular criminal case. And 13

we have a right to ask about this. 14

15 I think the point -- one point -- and I won't address this if the Court already agrees with 16 us. But it is the state's obligation to find out 17 whether or not their witness has bias. It is not 18 simply a question of whether or not they actually 19 physically possess a document. If they have reason 20 21 to believe that there might be such a document, 22 they need to go ask for it.

And I want to make another point on this 23 on the record, Your Honor. With respect to Dennis 24 Mehravar, we have scads of communication between us

and the state -- not scads, but several letters, 1 communication between us and the state in which the 3 state acknowledges that they need to talk to the plaintiffs' lawyers in these various cases. So it's not as if they don't know about a lawsuit or lawsuits. 6

You know, setting aside the fact that it's obvious that people are going to file lawsuits under these circumstances, but they, in fact, have knowledge of lawsuits being filed by various of the participants.

So they cannot just say we now -- we're 13 not going to actually ask for any complaints so, therefore, we won't have custody of the complaints. 14 15 They can't play that game. If they have knowledge 16 of something and they're communicating with these lawyers, they have a duty -- they have a duty to get them.

And one more point that Ms. Do points 20 out. We have listened to hours and hours of detective interviews. The detectives talk about 22 the lawsuits and the plaintiffs' lawyers. So it is 23 not the case that the state is unaware of the 24 existence of lawsuits.

All of this doesn't matter. Basically,

102

the bottom line is I have a good-faith basis to ask 2 questions of this witness relating to her bias.

- 3 I'm not seeking to introduce or move into evidence
- this complaint. I'm simply asking her about her
- 5 existing bias.

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

21

25

- 6 THE COURT: Ms. Polk.
- 7 MS. POLK: Your Honor, yes. Two points.
- 8 First of all, this is not a trial by surprise.
- 9 Again, going back to Rules 15.1 and 15.2, there is
- 10 an obligation on the parties to let the other side
- know what is the evidence we're going to use so 11
- 12 that if the state -- a party has an objection, a
- 13 party can file a motion in limine. We can brief
- 14 it, and we can get rulings from the Court ahead of
- time. 15

16 That's what these rules are about. And 17 that's where 15.2 clearly says. The defense has to disclose to the state any exhibits, records, or any 18 19 documents they intend to use. Copying from a civil 20 complaint language and writing it up in your script for cross-examination does not allow a party to

21 22 circumvent that rule.

23 If you're going to start reading from a 24 complaint, whether you have the complaint in your

hand or you retype it and put it in your script,

you still have an obligation to let the other side 1 know you intend to use this document.

And had the defense done so, then we 3 wouldn't be arguing this in a break. We could have 4

thoroughly briefed it. We would have argued it.

And we would have had a ruling from the Court ahead of time. So that's the first issue, the discovery 7

8 violation.

The second issue is the appropriate use 9 10 of the information, evidence of the lawsuit itself. Again, the state agrees that it is fair game to 11

question a witness on motive or bias as to whether 12 13 or not you filed a lawsuit. Mr. Li has done that.

This witness has admitted that she, in fact, filed 14 a lawsuit. That's part one. 15

But to go to the next step, which is, 16 then, start using a hearsay document and reading 17 from it to question a witness is simply not 18 19 allowed. She is not a party. She's not a party under Rule 801. Her attorney is not a party. And 20

21 the Hernandez case specifically talks about using a

document to examine or cross-examine a party to a 22 23 litigation.

This person is not a party, and it simply 24 25 does not fall under the hearsay exception.

104

Again, we don't know what the complaint 1

2 looks like. Is it verified or not? Is it signed

by her attorney? She's already said she didn't 3

really read it. And so to allow Mr. Li to continue 4

to question her about specific paragraphs is simply 5

unfair. And additionally it's unfair because a 6

copy has not been given to the state. 7

When we discussed this issue with the 8 9 Court concerning witness Dennis Mehravar, the Court

agreed with the state that if the defense was going 10

to be allowed to read from certain paragraphs, then 11

the state could read from some of the other 12

paragraphs, which didn't help the defense's case. 13

The defense is aware of that, and so now 14 what they've done is rather than bring that 15

16 complaint into court so that we can see the entire

document and have a fair redirect, if 17

cross-examination is going to be allowed, we can't 18

even do that because he's reading parts of a 19

20 document without bringing the entire document into

21 court and without giving it to the state.

22 And lastly, Judge, I'd like to just discuss for a moment Rule 408, offers to compromise 23

and compromise is not admissible, are not 24

admissible, except that you need to read 25

Subparagraph B, which says permitted uses. And the 1 second sentence says, examples of permissible purpose include proving a witness's bias or 3 4 prejudice.

And Mr. Li has used it to -- has used the lawsuit to establish bias or prejudice. Under Rule 408, then, the state is allowed to negate the suggestion of bias or prejudice by going into the compromise itself, to the settlement itself.

5

7

9

10

25

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Because very clearly, if this lawsuit has been settled, and I believe it has been, there is 11 no bias. There is no motive anymore to tailor 12 testimony because it won't affect anything. And so 13 the state is allowed to let the jury know that yes, 14 15 that lawsuit has been settled.

THE COURT: I'm a little bothered by the 16 implication, Ms. Polk, if you're indicating that 17 since the lawsuit is over, someone might revert 18 19 back to a different story or something. There is something that doesn't guite ring that -- you 20 21 know -- while the lawsuit is pending, there might 22 be a bias, but when it's over, something different could be said. There is just something about 23 that --24

MS. POLK: Your Honor, the suggestion is --

THE COURT: -- that's concerning. 1 2 Go ahead.

3 MS. POLK: The suggestion is being made by 4 Mr. Li that this witness has a motive or bias to lie. To complete the story, the jury needs to know 5 that that lawsuit is not pending. They can draw 6 whatever implications they want from it. But that 7 lawsuit is not pending. He has suggested through 8

cross-examination that her early statements which

10 were made shortly after the event somehow conflict 11 with her testimony today.

And now he's trying to suggest that there is a lawsuit out there and that she's trying to bolster her testimony today to somehow bolster that lawsuit. To complete the story, the jury needs to know that lawsuit isn't out there anymore.

THE COURT: I'm saying that -- here's the idea: If there have been depositions during the lawsuit and certain things said, the person would likely be -- I'm saying this in the abstract -- a person would likely be consistent with that or intend to be consistent regardless of whether or

22

23 not the case was resolved.

24 MR. LI: And, Your Honor, it hasn't been resolved. So this entire discussion is academic.

I mean, I would submit Ms. Polk's 1 reading is wrong. But it doesn't matter because it 2 hasn't been settled. 3

THE COURT: Ms. Polk, you didn't address the 4 Hernandez case when it talks about the use of the 5 claim letter. How is that distinguishable? 6

MS. POLK: Your Honor, again, because 7 Hernandez was a party to that action. And under 8 801 -- 801(d)(2), an admission by a party opponent 10 is allowed as an exception to the hearsay rule. She is not a party. 11

12 THE COURT: All right. I understand that. Okay. I'm going to go back. I have the case 13 14 handy.

MR. LI: Your Honor, if I may? 15 THE COURT: Go ahead. 16

MR. LI: If I can just short circuit some of 17 this. I'm not going much further with it. I have 18 one or two questions that are directly related to 19 bias. And I'm going to ask those questions. 20

21 We're not seeking to introduce the complaint. We've, basically, established the fact 22 of the complaint. And -- you know -- we're going 23

to -- I am going to put it in front of her to show 24 25

that she -- you know -- she did make a number of

108 those claims that I said that if anybody said this,

2 it would be untrue. I think I have an absolute right to do 3

that under Hernandez and other cases. It's not

being offered for the truth of the matter asserted. 5

It is being offered to show an inconsistent 6

statement and then also her bias. 7

THE COURT: And the inconsistent statement, 8 that is a -- that has admissibility bases beyond 9 10 the 801 Rule obviously.

But, Ms. Polk, go ahead.

MS. POLK: Well, first of all, it's not her 12 statement, Your Honor. It's a statement by an 13 14 attorney.

15 Secondly, Mr. Li has just, essentially, admitted it's a discovery violation. He has said 16 now he intends to put this complaint in front of 17 her. It's never been disclosed to the state. We 18 still don't have it. 19

THE COURT: Well, let me ask you in that 20 regard. You don't -- you're saying you had no idea 21 there were lawsuits and -- is that what you're 22 saying? You had no idea there were lawsuits --23

MS. POLK: Your Honor --24 THE COURT: -- sought out?

Page 105 to 108 of 275

25

1 MS. POLK: -- the state knows that there are lawsuits filed.

3

4

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2

3

4

5

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: And do you think that that would come under a disclosure obligation to have to say that? Or are you relying on the fact that the defense must have known that also? Because it would seem that the cases indicate the fact that a lawsuit is filed, that is something that goes to motive or bias. Isn't that something the state would normally disclose under Kyle Brady principles?

MS. POLK: Your Honor, not necessarily. But these witnesses have been interviewed. The defense is the one that attempted to ask them about lawsuits even though their client is a party to the lawsuits. Your Honor, these are lawsuits that their client is a party to.

THE COURT: So you're saying you would not have had to disclose that because they would have had to have known it?

21 MS. POLK: Yes. And it's not that I --

THE COURT: And they're saying they don't have to disclose it because you must have known it.

24 MS. POLK: Well, two separate issues. First

25 of all, there are Brady obligations. That is not

110

16

1 information within the state's possession.

THE COURT: So you're saying you did not know there were lawsuits filed. Because if you did know, then it was in your possession, it seems to me.

MS. POLK: Your Honor, the state is aware that 6 7 lawsuits were filed. And mostly we learned about it through the defense interviews of witnesses when the defendant started asking witnesses about 9 lawsuits and kind of probing, well, there is a 10 11 confidentiality agreement, trying to get witnesses to talk about the terms. And so that's how we 12 learned that there were lawsuits. So that's how we 13 learned about it. 14

Secondly, the Brady obligation applies to documents that are in our possession. They've never been in our possession.

And thirdly, their client is a party to those lawsuits. So that -- even if somehow the Court decided that the state had a Brady obligation to go out and actively find lawsuits --

THE COURT: And I didn't say that, Ms. Polk. I said if you already knew, though, you had the information. So I agree, no. You don't have to go out and investigate. I don't agree with that

1 proposition. If tell you that right now. I

2 don't agree that the state has to go out and

3 explore every possibility. But when you have

4 information and possess that, then that question

5 doesn't even arise.

6 MS. POLK: Yes. And then the next step is 7 under Rule 15.2, if you intend to use these 8 documents at trial, you have to disclose them, 9 period. You have to disclose them.

THE COURT: The questioning so far is
permissible. It's cross-examination from a
document that was -- well, I don't know the level
of endorsement. And that is an issue. And
obviously it would have been clear had this matter
been presented at an earlier time.

But the questions at this point, as

Mr. Li has indicated, you need a good-faith basis 17 to ask a question. And that's separate from the 18 ultimate admissibility of the extrinsic evidence of 19 the complaint itself. My feeling on that is that 20 that's a document people have been long aware of. 21 And it should have been disclosed if it was going 22 to be offered as actual evidence, extrinsic 23 evidence. And it wasn't. And the rules require 24 that. So the complaint itself would not be 25

112

1 admissible.

2 Cross-examination from the complaint -3 all right -- for this witness, it's been covered in
4 any event without objection to this point, and it's
5 going to be permitted. Cross-examination,
6 good-faith basis, that's the test.

7 MS. POLK: And, Your Honor, the state would8 request at this time a copy of the complaint from9 the defense.

THE COURT: And they're entitled to that. I think that's covered under 613. And I think the defense is offering this primarily under the authority of 613.

MS. POLK: And then, Your Honor, is the Court
going to allow the state to redirect regarding
everything that's in the complaint? I would just
note, Your Honor, this is not a verified complaint.
THE COURT: And I don't know that a complain

THE COURT: And I don't know that a complaint would --

Then the second question is -- I asked

MR. LI: Your Honor, the only questions we're asking are: One, did you file a complaint? And are you seeking money? And those are questions that we've established -- you know -- as a start. There is one other question along those lines.

28 of 69 sheets

25

her a number of questions. Have you ever claimed 2 "X"? And she said no. And this lawsuit makes 3 those claims.

4

7

8

2

I'm not going to walk through every one of them, but I'll walk through two of them. And I have a right to do that. This is a prior inconsistent statement.

THE COURT: Where is your authority for a complaint that's signed by an attorney?

9 10 MR. LI: She said that she reviewed it. And I'm entitled to ask her how far she's reviewed it. 11 12 I'm also entitled to refresh her recollection with 13 it. I'm entitled to ask good-faith basis questions 14 like isn't it true that in your complaint you said "X"? And she can say no. She can say I don't 15 remember. And I can say would it refresh your 16 17 recollection. This is very vanilla, Your Honor.

18 And I'm not asking to introduce these into evidence. We did talk about this several 19 20 weeks ago. And I think -- you know -- I am operating under the Court's guidelines. I 21 22 understand that the state would rather have these documents ahead of time. But we have a right to 23 have this witness tested as to her bias and motive without preparation, without her being able to 25

change her story on -- you know -- before she gets on the stand. We have a right to have the jury see

her admit that she has a bias. 3

MS. POLK: Your Honor, first of all, these are 4 not statements by the witness. These are 5 statements by her attorney. They do not fall under 6

7 Rule 801 because she's not a party.

Under Rule 801, statements made by an 8 agent or an attorney are also admissible as 9 10 statements by a party. But she's not a party. And so trying to impeach her with statements made by an 11 attorney in a state where you have to plead every 12 13 possible theory of liability when you file the 14 complaint is simply unprecedented.

There is no basis to show her the 15 complaint. She has admitted there is a lawsuit. 16 And that's the end of the inquiry. And there is 17

certainly no basis to confront her with statements 18 made by an attorney. These are not her statements. 19

20 And, essentially, what Mr. Li is asking is, was your attorney truthful? Your attorney made 21 these statements. Was he truthful? That's 22 completely collateral, completely inadmissible, and 23 just running far afield of what this inquiry is 24

25 about, which is does this witness have a bias or

motive? And chat comes out with the existence of a 1

lawsuit. And that has come out and she has

admitted it. There is no basis to go any further.

She has admitted that there is a lawsuit. 4

THE COURT: There is a difference between the 5 prior inconsistent statement and good-faith basis 6 for a question also. I don't think the test is the 7

same. 8

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

8

18

19

21

In any event, the complaint itself is not 9 going to be admitted. And then you get to the 10 problem, though, of going into so much detail that, 11 essentially, it's coming into evidence indirectly. 12

MR. LI: Your Honor, the only --

THE COURT: I'm still waiting for -- you're 14 saying that she's seen this statement, and somehow 15 that means it's been adopted and is her statement 16 by operation of law. 17

MR. LI: Well, I think the Hernandez case is very instructive on this point, that the duties -the State of Arizona has a policy reason to hold everybody who makes a claim, no matter what form its made, to the truth that is stated in those claims. There is a policy duty that you don't just willy-nilly file a lawsuit.

THE COURT: And I've acknowledged that.

114

MR. LI: Okay.

THE COURT: I've said is there any 2

distinction -- right from the start, is there a 3

distinction between a claim letter under Title 12

and the complaint? Is there really a distinction? 5

That's what I asked at the very start. And you're

7 saying now --

MR. LI: And I would say no.

THE COURT: Ms. Polk said the distinction is 9 in the Hernandez is you're actually dealing with 10 the lawsuit itself and you're dealing with parties. 11

Ms. Polk says that is the key distinction there. 12

I need to read the case because it's been 13 a few weeks. And I'm going to do that.

14 Right now, as I've indicated, based on 15 the good-faith bases for questioning, these 16

17 questions can be asked.

MR. LI: I have a copy of the case that I can give you. May I approach?

20 THE COURT: Yes.

There is enough to permit

cross-examination. The document itself will not be 22 23 admitted.

And I'd like to resume about 11:00. 24 25

MS. POLK: Your Honor, in terms of redirect --

can I see the --THE COURT: I'm going 2 everyone has seen the complaint, I guess, now except me.

MR. LI: That seems unfair.

THE COURT: What we'll do is I'll need to come out before the jury.

We'll be in recess. Thank you.

MR. LI: Thank you.

(Recess.)

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

THE COURT: The record will show the presence 10 11 of the defendant, Mr. Ray, and the attorneys. The witness and the jury are not present. 12

13 Counsel, I have not been provided a great 14 deal of law on this rather complex issue.

Recalling back to the situation with Mr. Mehravar, 15 16 I can say this: My concern there was impeachment

17 with a notice pleading complaint that talked about

18 toxins and various theories that are presented in a

conclusory notice pleading type fashion where a 19

20 client, if you will, or a person very unlikely have

21 any knowledge of those kinds of technical terms and 22 the pleading.

23 And I even wondered at that time if there 24 wouldn't be a different situation if the pleading 25 went beyond the notice that's required at least in

118

Arizona, went beyond that and provided some type of

2 detail where logic would indicate the source of the

3 that detail. And that gets you into the question

4 of what's a good-faith basis for a question.

Different situation. And I don't think I've been 5

provided any authority. 6

7

8

9

10

11

13

16

18

19

20

21

22

25

I appreciate the state's distinction in Hernandez saying that that's the parties. But it gets you back to the same kinds of issues. When is an attorney's presentation something that can be used in some fashion against a client whether in that suit or another suit? Totally separate case.

12 So I'm going to recess. I'm going to 14 look into this. And we're going to have the jury come back at 1:15. I want the parties here at 15 1:00. And I'll have a ruling. We'll proceed at 17 that time. Thank you. We are in recess.

(Recess.)

THE COURT: The record will show the presence of the defendant, Mr. Ray, the attorneys, not the jury or the witness. I had a chance to look at some of the case law.

Mr. Hughes, Ms. Polk, you did receive the 23 two cases that I was provided. 24

MS. POLK: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Back to the basics. This

issue does not involve hearsay. Thinking back to

Mr. Mehravar, in that case, the concern I had was

offering some statements about cause being toxins, 4

5 that being alleged in the complaint, and somehow

suggesting that's the truth of what happened. 6

7 With regard to Ms. Gennari, the statement

is not in any way being offered for the truth. 8

It's offered as an inconsistent statement, for one 9

10 thing, which can implicate hearsay concerns. But

it's also offered to show bias and motive. 11 12 So 801(d)(2) is just not directly

applicable to this situation. It's not offered for 13

14 the truth.

I think the best guide for this issue is 15

Rule 613. That in one sense handles the disclosure 16

issue. And I think the Osborn case, which has been 17

cited in another context, deals with that question. 18

And it draws a distinction -- the Osborn case draws 19

a distinction between testimonial evidence and then 20

21 real evidence.

And if you will recall, the Osborn case 22 came up in conjunction with a photograph being 23

presented for the first time. And I disallowed 24

that. I don't think the Osborn case provided 25

120

authority for that. But the Osborn case does

provide strong authority for the proposition that

if statements are going to be used, basically, for 3

impeachment, they don't have to be provided to the 4

other side. Rule 613 controls that. 5

Then the question becomes is this, in 6

fact, a statement of Ms. Gennari? And the 7

authority I've been provided by the defense

indicates, as I think I've somewhat indicated, has 9

to do with whether or not the person has knowledge 10

of what's in the complaint. 11

I've reviewed the testimony of

Ms. Gennari. And she did indicate she read 13

something to the effect as much as I could stand or 14

something like that but had read this. So, in any 15

event, the information is proper impeachment. It's 16

proper impeachment. 17

It's a different question as to whether 18 it can come in as extrinsic evidence. I have not 19 20 seen direct authority on that. But if it is a statement, there is a possibility of extrinsic 21

evidence being admitted as long as 613(b) is 22

complied with. So the cross-examination on the 23

24 complaint is going to be allowed.

Ms. Polk, you had indicated a concern

25

about would you be allowed to tak about other parts of the complaint. What would your basis for that 3 be?

4

7

9

10

MS. POLK: Your Honor, it depends on what the cross-examination is. But if the cross-examination 5 about the complaint is allowed, then clearly the state gets to go wherever redirect would take us as long as it would be relevant. If doors are opened, if topics are approached, then the state would be allowed appropriate follow-up.

11 THE COURT: It would seem to me that if --12 essentially, what's at stake here is an 13 inconsistent statement. If that's the crux of it, 14 I don't know why potentially consistent statements would be admissible. I guess we'll just have to 15 16 see what happens.

17 MS. POLK: Your Honor, I'm not looking at consistent statements. I'm just not looking at an 18 issue of rehabilitation. What I'm looking at 19 20 are -- cross-examination in Arizona is not limited 21 to the direct. So if cross-examination goes into 22 new topics not covered on direct, then redirect can 23 cover topics raised upon cross-examination.

THE COURT: Absolutely. 24

25 MS. POLK: And that's what I'm looking at.

types of grou 1

2 But in that particular case, there is just a finding that the trial court's decision to exclude the factual aberrants, the civil suit, was 4 5

6 And as I indicated before, the distinction with Mr. Mehravar, as I'm seeing it, is 7 what's being dealt with with regard with 8 Ms. Gennari are factual aberrants as opposed to 9

10 notice pleading, general statements. And that is an important distinction. 11

12 Then we'll get the jury in.

13 Anything else?

Oh. There was a note -- two notes. One 14

I've already indicated I'll cover with regard to 15 the witness list. But then another note that had 16

to do with a juror who was approached but seemed to 17

do the right thing in not letting further 18

discussion proceed. 19

Does anybody feel that they need to 20 follow up other than to acknowledge that this is 21 the appropriate thing to do? 22

23 Ms. Polk?

MS. POLK: No, Your Honor. 24

MR. LI: No, Your Honor.

MR. LI: Thank you.

122

25

3

10

16

20

21

23

The ability -- the state was not put on notice that

the defense was going to raise this issue of the 2

3 lawsuit. We were not put on notice of the document

itself. Then appropriate redirect to go into those

areas -- the fact of the lawsuit, issues raised on 5

cross-examination -- would be appropriate. 6

7 THE COURT: Mr. Li.

MR. LI: I think it's still got to be governed 8

9 by the rules of evidence. And -- you know -- I

10 don't know what topics Ms. Polk's referring to.

11 But obviously if it complies with the rules of

12 evidence and it's covered by something that I bring

13 up in cross, then it makes sense. But if it's not

14 covered by the rules of evidence, then it's not

15 admissible and the questions would not be proper.

16 THE COURT: I do want to provide one citation

17 out of another jurisdiction. This issue may come

18 up again. And I want to have all of the law

19 presented. But Commonwealth versus Hanford, 937 2d

20 1094, out of Pennsylvania. And a lot of this law,

when you're talking about admissibility of 21

22 complaints, has to do with the law in effect, is

23 that some form of judicial admission in different

laws in different states say different things about 24

that. So this case may be distinguishable on those

THE COURT: So we'll cover this before we 1

2 recess today. Thank you.

(Proceedings continued in the presence of 4

5 jury.)

THE COURT: The record will show the presence 6

of the defendant, Mr. Ray, the attorneys, the jury. 7 Ms. Gennari is on the witness stand. She has been

9 sworn.

Mr. Li.

11 MR. LI: Thank you, Your Honor.

Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Gennari. Before the 12 break we were talking about a lawsuit that you had 13

14 filed against James Ray International. Do you

15 remember that?

A. Yes.

Q. And I believe I made a mistake and I said 17

that you had filed it in September of 2009. You 18

filed it in September of 2010; is that correct? 19

A. Yes.

Q. And that's about 11 months after you made

22 your statement to the police; correct?

Α. Yes.

Now, before the break I had asked you a 24 Q.

series of questions about whether or not you had

6

7

- 1 ever claimed certain things. Do dremember that
- 2 line of questioning?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. I asked you, for instance, whether you5 had ever claimed that when you tried to leave the
- 6 sweat lodge, Mr. Ray blocked your passage with
- 7 threats of offensive touching. Do you remember
- 8 that?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And you said that you had never made that
- 11 claim?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And, in fact, you said that if anybody
- 14 said that, that would be untrue. Do you remember
- 15 that?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. I also asked you whether you had ever18 claimed that you had witnessed Mr. Ray do so to
- 19 other participants. Do you remember that?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And you said that you had not
- 22 witnessed -- you had never said that you had
- 23 witnessed Mr. Ray doing that to other participants.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And do you remember, I asked you if
 - I somebody said that you had witnessed other --
- 2 Mr. Ray do so to other participants, that too would
- 3 be untrue?

5

- 4 A. Yes.
 - Q. Do you remember that?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. I also asked you --
- 8 MS. POLK: Judge, asked and answered all these
- 9 questions.
- 10 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 11 Q. BY MR. LI: I also asked you whether you
- 12 had ever claimed that when you wanted to leave the
- 13 sweat lodge, Mr. Ray physically touched you in an
- 14 offensive way thereby causing you injuries and
- 14 Offensive way thereby causing you injuries at
- 15 extreme emotional distress.
- 16 Do you remember that?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And you said that you had never made that
- 19 claim?

21

- 20 A. Yes.
 - Q. And I asked you if somebody said that,
- 22 that would be untrue. Do you remember that?
- 23 A. Yes
- 24 Q. Now, in your lawsuit that you filed on
- 25 September -- in September 2010, you made the

- 1 following claim, did you not?
 - A. Can I ---
- 3 Q. I'm going to ask you a question. And if
- 4 it will refresh your recollection to look at your
- 5 lawsuit, I will show it to you. Okay?
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. Did you say when plaintiff, that's you,
- 8 attempted to escape from the sweat lodge,
- 9 defendant, James Arthur Ray, blocked her passage
- 10 with threats of offensive touching? Did you say
- 11 that?
- 12 A. What I wanted to say is that I recalled 13 over the break that I -- what I had read with my
- 13 over the break that I -- what I had read with my
- 14 lawyer was a bunch of back and forth, and I had
- 15 actually not read what he filed.
 - Q. I'm going to place this before you.
- 17 If I may approach the witness?
- 18 THE COURT: Yes.
- 19 Q. BY MR. LI: And I'd ask you to look at
- 20 lines 6 through 7, 8 through 9, and then 11 through
- **21** 14.

16

- 22 MS. POLK: Counsel, could I have the page
- 23 number.
- MR. LI: Page 4, lines 6 through approximately
- **25** 14.

3

13

19

20

126

- 1 Q. Ms. Gennari, have you had a chance to
- 2 read lines 6 through 14?
 - A. Yes. I have now.
- 4 Q. Is your recollection refreshed that your
- 5 lawsuit alleges that Mr. Ray blocked your passage
- 6 with threats of offensive touching?
- 7 A. This shows me that that is what my lawyer
- 8 filed. In our conversations that's not the story I
- 9 told him. But it looks like we crossed wires.
- 10 Q. So your lawsuit, then, in which you are
- 11 claiming monetary damages from James Ray
- 12 International, Mr. Ray, and others, is untrue?
 - A. It's not expressed properly.
- 14 Q. Well, ma'am, I believe when I asked you
- 15 on cross-examination whether -- if anybody said
- 16 Mr. Ray blocked your passage with threats of
- 17 offensive touching, you said that that would be
- 18 untrue. Correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. So your lawsuit alleges that Mr. Ray
- 21 blocked your passage with threats of offensive
- 22 touching; correct?
- 23 A. And this is honestly the first time I'm 24 seeing this.
 - Q. But I'm just asking you. Is that

128

22

23

24

25

you off.

we had had. But as this was -- as it was

So -- I'm sorry. I apologize for cutting

This is -- this is not my world. I don't

finalized, I actually didn't --

Q. Please take a look for the record at

convicted in this trial, you get your attorney's

Your lawsuit claims that if Mr. Ray is

page 5, lines 3 through 6.

Okay.

Α.

Q.

21

22

23

8

11

15

21

25

2

8

16

19

22

25

1 know how it works.

- **Q.** So these various allegations about you
- 3 being blocked at the door -- your attorney just
- 4 made those up without your input?
 - MS. POLK: Objection. Speculation.
- 6 THE COURT: Sustained.
- **Q.** BY MR. LI: Did you tell your lawyer that
- 8 Mr. Ray had attempted to block you at the door
- 9 physically?

5

10 A. I told him he prevented me from leaving

- 11 by telling me that I was too late.
- 12 Q. And so, therefore, what's written in your
- 13 lawsuit in which you are seeking --
- 14 A. Clearly we crossed wires.
- **Q.** Let me just finish the question, ma'am.
- 16 Therefore, what's written in your
- 17 lawsuit, in which you're claiming money, including
- 18 attorney's fees, if Mr. Ray is convicted is false?
- 19 A. As it stands, we need to amend that.
- **Q.** You signed up for Spiritual Warrior
- 21 approximately what? A year before the event?
- 22 A. Pretty much.
- 23 Q. And you received a participant guide that
- 24 was mass-mailed to you?
- 25 A. Yes.

134

- 1 Q. If I could get Exhibit 736 up on the
- 2 screen.
- 3 Do you recall seeing something like this
- 4 emailed to you?
- 5 A. Yes.
- **Q.** And I'm going to hand it to you in a sec.
- 7 If you could look at pages 11 through 14.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- **9 Q.** I'm not going to ask you in detail about
- 10 it yet. Those are liability waiver forms; correct?
- 11 A. Yes.
- MR. LI: If we could have page 11 up on the
- 13 screen.

8

21

- 14 Q. And this is the Spiritual Warrior
- 15 waiver -- Release Waiver of Liability, Assumption
- 16 of Risk Indemnity and Disclaimer; right?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And you received this about a year before
- 19 the event -- I'm sorry. I apologize. You received
- 20 this sometime in July --
 - A. Yes.
- 22 Q. -- is that correct?
- 23 A. Something like that. Summer.
- 24 Q. That's about what?
- 25 A. Three months.

- 1 Q. The months before the event? And you
- 2 had a chance to look through it; correct?
 - A. Yes.
- 4 Q. And, in fact, I believe you told
- 5 Detective Willingham on October 27 that you knew
- 6 about the Vision Quest because you had read about
- 7 it in the release?
 - A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And you had also read about the sweat
- 10 lodge ceremony?
 - A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And that's a ceremonial sauna involving
- 13 tight spaces and intense heat?
- 14 A. Yes.
 - Q. And you had read about that; correct?
- 16 A. (No audible response.)
- 17 Q. Now, at the bottom of paragraph 2, there
- 18 is a section that says, I fully understand and
- 19 acknowledge there is no requirement whatsoever that
- 20 I participate in the activities.
 - Do you recall that?
- 22 A. Where are you?
- **Q.** Sorry.
- 24 If I may approach, Your Honor?
 - THE COURT: You may.

- 1 THE WITNESS: That's what it says.
 - Q. BY MR. LI: And you recall reading that?
- 3 A. Actually, I don't recall reading that. I
- 4 recall -- I recall looking for details of what we
- 5 were going to do.
- 6 Q. Okay. Eventually you signed some
- 7 waivers, did you not?
 - A. Yes.
- 9 MR. LI: I don't know if Exhibits 178 and 179
- 10 are in evidence. Are they?
- 11 If I may approach, in any event?
- 12 THE COURT: Yes.
- 13 They're marked.
- 14 Q. BY MR. LI: If you could look at the
- 15 signature page.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- 17 Q. Those are the waiver forms you signed;
- 18 correct?
 - A. Yes.
- 20 MR. LI: If I could have Exhibit 178 -- move
- 21 Exhibits 178 and 179 into evidence.
 - THE COURT: Counsel?
- MS. POLK: May I see the exhibits, Counsel?
- MR. LI: Yes.
 - MS. POLK: Your Honor, the state has no

3

13

15

22

25

1

2

11

12

18

21

25

- 1 objection to Exhibits 178 and 179.
- 2 THE COURT: 178 and 179 are admitted.
- 3 (Exhibits 178 and 179 admitted.)
- MR. LI: May I approach, Your Honor?
- 5 THE COURT: Yes.
- **Q.** BY MR. LI: Placing before you
- 7 Exhibit 178, if you could look at the second
- 8 paragraph, the bottom part, page 2, second
- 9 paragraph, bottom part starting with, I fully
- 10 understand.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And the waiver that you signed said, I
- 13 fully understand and acknowledge there is no
- 14 requirement whatsoever that I participate in the
- 15 activity?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Do you recall that?
- 18 A. I see it.
- 19 Q. And you signed it?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And it also, then, says, if I do choose
- 22 to participate in any of the activities, I affirm
- 23 that I have not been nor will I be coerced or
- 24 persuaded in any way to do so.
- 25 Do you recall that?

- 138
- A. I'm supposed to be precognitive?
- Q. My question is, does the waiver say, I
- 3 affirm that I have not been nor will I be coerced
- 4 or persuaded in any way to do so?
 - A. That's what it says.
 - Q. Is that the waiver you signed?
- 7 A. Yes.

1

2

5

6

8

- Q. Okay. And then the waiver also says, and
- 9 I assume full responsibility for and risk of any
- 10 injuries sustained in connection with the
- 11 activities whether caused by negligence of the
- 12 releasees or otherwise. It says that, doesn't it?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And, in fact, you signed that waiver,
- 15 didn't you?
- 16 A. Yes.
- MR. LI: Now, if I may approach, Your Honor?
- 18 THE COURT: Yes.
- 19 Q. BY MR. LI: I'd ask you to look at the
- 20 last paragraph above your signature page on the
- 21 second page of the waiver. So this is the last
- 22 paragraph.

24

- 23 If we can blow that up.
 - You say that -- the waiver said, I
- 25 acknowledge that I've been given the opportunity by

- the company to ask questions regarding any aspect
- 2 of this waiver; correct?
 - A. Yes.
- **Q.** And it also says, by signing below, I
- 5 acknowledge that I have carefully and completely
- 6 read and fully understand all aspects of this
- 7 agreement and voluntarily agree to all of the terms
- 8 and conditions stated in this document, and that in
- 9 doing so I have not relied upon any oral
- 10 representations, statements, or inducements apart
- 11 from the statements made expressly herein, meaning
- 12 within the waiver.
 - That's what it says; correct?
- 14 A. Yes.
 - Q. And then you signed right below that?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. With a witness?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And you signed this waiver on
- 20 October 3rd, 2009, about 11 months before you filed
- 21 your lawsuit?
 - A. Yes.
- 23 Q. If we could talk for a second now about
- 24 your experience in the sweat lodge.
 - And if I could have Exhibit 414 up on the

 - So you recall this diagram; right?
- 3 A. Yes.

display.

- 4 Q. And you indicated that you were somewhere
- 5 in the 8:00 o'clock position?
- 6 A. 8:00, 8:30, something like that.
- **Q.** 8:00, 8:30, somewhere around in there?
- 8 A. Uh-huh.
- **9** Q. And that Ms. Neuman was at the
- 10 9:00 o'clock position?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Now, Ms. Neuman was on your left?
- 13 A. Uh-huh. Yes.
- 14 Q. And Ms. Tucker, Laurie Tucker --
- 15 A. Laura.
- 16 Q. Laura Tucker. I apologize. Laura Tucker
- 17 was where?
 - A. She was the next one down.
- 19 Q. Next to who?
- 20 A. Next to Liz.
 - Q. So she was on the other side of Liz --
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. -- correct? So if you could just mark on
- 24 the monitor where she was approximately.
 - And she was right next to Ms. Neuman;

- 1 correct?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Now, you had indicated on direct that
- 4 Ms. Neuman was asked to go there by Mr. Ray?
 - A. Yes.
- **Q.** And that the Dream Team members were
- 7 being placed at the various corners, as it were, of
- 8 the sweat lodge?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And you understood that Ms. Neuman was
- 11 there to help the participants, such as yourself,
- 12 in their experience in the sweat lodge; correct?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And that's because -- you had met
- 15 Ms. Neuman before?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And you had met her in the event?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And you knew her to be a strong, smart,
- 20 capable woman?
- 21 A. I didn't know her. I literally had met
- 22 her to know her name.
- 23 Q. She was --
- 24 A. That's really all I know about her.
- 25 Q. But she was a gung ho, impressive person;
 - 142

- 1 correct?
- 2 A. Not really.
- 3 Q. You don't think she was a -- which part
- 4 do you not agree with?
- 5 A. She didn't strike me as gung ho,
- 6 impressive. She was just normal, just someone I
- 7 met.
- **Q.** Did she seem happy to be doing the sweat
- 9 lodge?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Did she seem excited about the
- 12 opportunity to go do a sweat lodge?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Had she indicated to you all that she had
- 15 done sweat lodges before?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And did she tell you, hey? Don't be
- 18 nervous?
- 19 A. I don't recall.
- **Q.** Did you hear her telling Laura not to be
- 21 nervous?
- 22 A. I don't recall that.
- 23 Q. Did you hear her telling Laura how to get
- 24 through the sweat lodge?
- 25 A. I recall her mentioning various ways to

1 sit.

5

8

15

25

- Q. Okay. Now, was she talking to you or
- 3 just to Laura?
- 4 A. She was mostly talking to Laura.
 - Q. Okay. So she and Laura were having a
- 6 conversation about how to get through the sweat
- 7 lodge ceremony; correct?
 - A. But then she turned her other direction
- 9 and include other people in the conversation.
- 10 Q. And the other people would be you, for
- 11 instance?
- 12 A. And the -- yeah.
- 13 Q. And so she would say specifically -- you
- 14 know -- put your hands in the dirt?
 - A. No.
- 16 Q. Did you discover that yourself?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And you discovered that by sticking your
- 19 hands in the dirt, it was actually pretty cool?
- 20 A. Underneath. Yes.
- 21 Q. And that, in fact, it was nice and cool?
- 22 A. It was very cool.
- 23 Q. Okay. And so on direct examination I
- 24 believe you told us that the first round was okay.
 - A. Yes.

- 144
- 1 Q. The second round was like being on the
- 2 bottom bench of a sauna?
- 3 A. The first round was like the bottom
- 4 bench.
- **Q.** Okay. I apologize.
- 6 A. The second round was the top bench.
- 7 Q. All right. And then the third round had
- 8 started to get unbearable?
- 9 A. Started to get uncomfortable. Yes.
- 10 Q. Okay. Uncomfortable. But that's not
- 11 exactly what you told Detective Willingham on
- 12 October 27. You told her something different,
- 13 didn't you?

- 14 A. I don't have the conversation memorized.
 - MR. LI: Your Honor, I'd like to play
- **16** Exhibit 644 at 1050 -- time stamp 1050 to 1123.
- 17 Ms. Polk, this is on the transcript at
- 18 page 5, lines 14 through 21.
- 19 MS. POLK: Your Honor, the witness at this
- 20 point has simply said she doesn't recall. There is
- 21 not a specific question about a specific
- 22 conversation. I would ask that the witness be
- 23 allowed to refresh her recollection. Otherwise,
- 24 this is simply hearsay.
 - 25 THE COURT: I think in this instance 613(b)

permits explanation before extrinsic evidence would be admitted. At least in this instance, that's

3 what I'm ruling.

Q. BY MR. LI: Ma'am, did you say, from
round 3 on because it was nice and cool and I could
dig my hands in and I could feel the cool

7 underneath and it was just sort of concentrating on

how cool it was -- you know -- half an inch down

9 under the gravel?

Yeah. It just didn't -- yeah. It wasjust nice and cool. And I concentrated on my

12 hands. And I think my hands -- not through the

13 wall, but I think right under it because I could

14 feel a breeze on my very fingertips occasionally.

15 Did you say that?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And, in fact, when you said it, you said

18 it with a somewhat relaxed, explanatory tone;

19 correct?

20 A. I don't know.

21 MR. LI: Your Honor, I'd like to play Exhibit

22 644 at the time stamp.

23 MS. POLK: Same objection, Judge. It's

24 hearsay.

1

2

7

8

25 THE COURT: Overruled.

146

You may play it.

MR. LI: Thank you.

3 (Exhibit 644 played.)

Q. BY MR. LI: So true or false? You werenot saying that you were struggling from round 3

6 on; correct?

A. I was saying that I was concentrating on the parts of me that were cool.

9 Q. And you said that it was nice and cool on10 your fingertips, and you could feel a breeze

11 underneath the tent; correct?

12 A. Yes.

Q. You did not say that from round 3 you

14 were struggling, did you?

15 MS. POLK: Your Honor, I would ask that the

16 witness be provided with the transcript. These are

17 excerpts being taken out of context. She's being

18 asked to talk about an entire interview.

19 THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. BY MR. LI: Now, at some point Liz

21 began -- you tried to help prop Liz up against your

22 legs; correct?

24

23 A. Yes

Q. And that's when it became too much --

25 A. Yes.

Q. -- correct?

And that's when you decided to scoot out

3 the lodge?

1 2

5

8

12

16

19

3

8

14

15

17 18

21

4 A. Yes.

Q. Now, do you remember that in round 4 or

6 5, Liz Neuman changed her position and sort of put

7 her head closer towards the pit?

A. I don't recall.

9 Q. You don't have any reason to dispute

10 that? Do you if, for instance, Ms. Tucker said

11 that's what happened?

A. I -- honestly, I have no idea.

13 Q. Okay. Do you remember Ms. Tucker nudging

14 Ms. Neuman to come back from the pit and that -- do

15 you remember that?

A. No.

17 Q. Do you remember Liz Neuman shaking Laura

18 Tucker off?

A. No.

Q. And do you remember at some point Liz

21 Neuman changed her position again and sat with her

22 feet towards the pit and started leaning back

23 against Ms. Tucker?

24 A. I had my face in the dirt. I had no idea

25 what Liz was doing.

148

1 Q. Okay. At some point in the seventh round

2 you became concerned?

A. Yes.

4 Q. And do you recall Ms. Tucker touching Liz

5 Neuman on the shoulder and saying, are you okay?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And do you recall Ms. Neuman saying, yes?

A. I remember Laura asking if she wanted to

9 leave.

10 Q. Okay. Separate question. And we'll get

11 to that. Do you remember the first part? Do you

12 remember Ms. Tucker asking Liz Neuman, are you

13 okay, and then Ms. Neuman saying yes?

A. I don't recall that.

Q. Do you recall Ms. Neuman saying, yes,

16 promptly and without delay?

A. I don't recall --

Q. But do you have --

19 A. -- that exchange.

20 Q. Sorry.

A. I don't know.

22 Q. Do you have any reason to dispute if

23 Ms. Tucker says that's what happened?

24 MS. POLK: Objection. Argumentative.

25 THE COURT: Sustained.

4

5

8

12

15

18

3

6

16

20

150

- Q. BY MR. LI: You just andn't hear it? 1 2 Α. I was concentrating on my fingers. 3 Q. I understand, Ms. Gennari. A. My entire being was concentrating on my 4 5
 - fingers. I don't know.
- 6 **Q.** So my question simply is you don't recall 7 hearing that conversation?
 - A. I don't know.
- Q. Okay. And at some point Ms. Tucker asked 9
- Ms. Neuman, do you need to get out of here? 10
- Yes. 11
- Q. And that's when Ms. Neuman said, no. No. 12
- 13 No?

8

- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 And I believe on direct on Friday you
- said that she sounded like she was drunk. 16
- A. Yes. 17
- Q. And that she was slurring? 18
- A. Yes. 19
- 20 Q. But that's not what you told
- 21 Detective Willingham on October 27, 2009, is it?
- 22 A. I don't know.
- 23 MR. LI: Your Honor, may I approach?
- 24 THE COURT: Yes.
- 25 MR. LI: You know what. I have the wrong
- exhibit. Sorry. 1
- 2 Q. And I'd ask you to look at lines 2
- through 6.
- 4 And, Counsel, that's at page 5.
- Have you had a chance to review that? 5
- A. Yes. 6
- 7 **Q.** Is your recollection now refreshed that
- you did not say to Detective Willingham that she 8
- 9 sounded drunk?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And, in fact, the -- and you did not say
- 12 to Detective Willingham that she was drunk?
- 13 A. No, I didn't.
- 14 Q. And, in fact, the tone you used in --
- when you said, what I heard was no, no, no, was not 15
- 16 the same slurring tone you used on direct
- 17 examination, was it?
- 18 A. I don't know.
- 19 MR. LI: Your Honor, I'd ask to play
- 20 Exhibit 644, clip 1017 through 42.
 - THE COURT: All right.
- 22 MR. LI: Your Honor, is it okay?
- 23 THE COURT: Yes.
- 24 MR. LI: Thank you. I'm sorry. I didn't
- 25 hear.

- (Exmpit 644 played.)
- Q. BY MR. LI: Now, at some point you 2
- decided to leave the lodge; correct? 3
 - Α. Yes.
 - Q. And then at that point you were told that
- the round is over? You got to find a spot?
- 7 Α. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. We'll get to that in a second.
- Now, finishing off this conversation about
- Ms. Neuman, you, in fact, did not know that 10
- Ms. Neuman was dying, did you? 11
 - Α. No.
- 13 You absolutely did not know that she was
- dying at that point, did you? 14
 - A. No.
- Q. Had you known, you would have done 16
- something; correct? 17
 - A. I'd like to think so.
- 19 Q. You'd like to think so. And isn't it
- true that you told Detective Willingham that you 20
- 21 didn't know because you're not inside someone's
- body and you can't hook them up to a computer like 22
- 23 they do with cars; correct?
- 24 Α. True.
- 25 Q. And what you meant by that is that I
- 152
- can't tell what anybody here is feeling better than
- 2 what they can tell to themselves; correct?
 - A. True.
- Q. Only the person who is sitting there 4
- actually knows how they're feeling; correct? 5
 - If they're capable of knowing that, yes.
- 7 Q. And that's what you meant by that. What
- you meant was you can't hook a little device into
- somebody -- like a computer -- and know how they're 9
- 10 feeling?
- Well, and I can't also determine whether 11
- they are right about what they are reporting they
- 13 are feeling.
- 14 Q. I understand that. But you don't know
- one way or the another; correct? 15
 - Α. No.
- 17 Q. And, in fact, you told
- Detective Willingham, how do you know what's going 18
- 19 on in there; isn't that true?
 - A. I don't specifically remember.
- 21 Q. Would it refresh your recollection to
- look at your -- the transcript of your interview? 22
- 23 This is page, Counsel, 23, lines 20
- 24 through 22.
- 25 May I approach?

2

5

6

18

21

2

154

- 1 THE COURT: Yes.
- **Q.** BY MR. LI: Is your recollection now
- 3 refreshed?

4

- A. Yes.
- **Q.** You did tell Detective Willingham that
- 6 you're not inside someone's body and you can't hook
- 7 them up to a computer like they do with cars? How
- 8 do you know what's going on in there?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And what you mean simply is that you
- 11 didn't know Liz Neuman was dying?
- 12 A. Right.
- 13 Q. Now, I want to ask you some questions
- 14 about your testimony relating to the end of the
- 15 sweat lodge ceremony. Now, I believe on direct
- 16 examination you told Ms. Polk that at the end of
- 17 the ceremony you blacked out?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And during your interview with
- 20 Detective Willingham, about 11 months before your
- 21 lawsuit, you discussed the end of the ceremony on
- 22 at least three separate occasions during the
- 23 interview.
- 24 Do you remember that?
- 25 A. Some of it.

Q.

And you actually never mentioned blacking

2 out?

1

- 3 A. No. It wasn't -- it wasn't until later
- 4 that I realized I was missing time.
- 5 MR. LI: Your Honor, if I could play
- 6 Exhibit 644, clip at -- not clip. At 1327 through
- **7** 1432.
- 8 This is page 6, Counsel, lines 21 through
- **9** 26.
- 10 MS. POLK: I'm sorry. What page?
- 11 MR. LI: Page 6, lines 21 through 26.
- 12 THE COURT: All right.
- 13 MR. LI: Thank you.
- 14 (Exhibit 644 played.)
- **Q.** BY MR. LI: So in your conversation with
- 16 Detective Willingham on October 27, 2009, 11 months
- 17 before you filed your lawsuit, you didn't mention
- 18 that you had blacked out?
- 19 A. I didn't know I had blacked out until I
- was going over the events with somebody else who
 pointed out that I had completely missed everybody
- 22 else leaving.
- -- ----
- **Q.** I guess the question is that you told
- 24 Detective Willingham that you just sat there and
- 25 waited for them to decide which row should go out,

- 1 the back row or the front row? Correct?
 - A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And then the two of you --
- 4 A. And that's the last thing I remember --
 - Q. And the two --
 - A. -- until opening my eyes and finding
- 7 there were people behind me working to drag
- 8 somebody out and nobody else was in the lodge.
- 9 Q. Okay. And then you and
- 10 Detective Willingham had a little chuckle about
- 11 that on the tape. Do you remember?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And then some people wanted to get some
- 14 other people out first, and you said, no. No.
- 15 No -- or wanted to get you out. And you said, no.
- 16 No. No. Get somebody else. I have -- you know --
- 17 I'm feeling the breeze and clean air.
 - A. Yes.
- 19 Q. That's what you told Detective Willingham
- 20 on October 27, 2009; correct?
 - A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Now, a few minutes later in the same
- 23 interview, you told Detective Willingham -- you
- 24 described the end of the sweat lodge ceremony
- 25 again. Do you recall that?
- 1 A. No.
 - Q. Well, and at that point you again did not
- 3 mention blacking out?
- 4 A. Right. Like I said, I didn't know that I
- 5 was missing time until much later.
- 6 MR. LI: I'd ask to play Exhibit 644, time
- **7** stamp 1533 to 1630.
- 8 For Counsel it's page 8, lines 2 through
- 9 16.

15

- 10 MS. POLK: Your Honor, hearsay. The witness
- 11 has admitted.
- MR. LI: I think the tone of the witness
- 13 matters, Your Honor.
- 14 THE COURT: Overruled.
 - You may play that excerpt.
- 16 (Exhibit 644 played.)
- 17 Q. BY MR. LI: Ms. Gennari, in your
- 18 statement to Detective Willingham on October 27,
- 19 2009, you said, I'm here in the fresh air. I'm --
- 20 you know -- pretty -- I'm okay; correct?
 - A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And finally you spoke to
- 23 Detective Willingham a little later on in your
- 24 interview. And again you mention the end of the
- 25 sweat lodge ceremony. Do you remember that?

A. (No audible response.)

Q. And again you told her that you were

3 fine?

1

2

4

5

7

18

25

A. Probably.

MR. LI: Your Honor, I'd ask to play

Exhibit 644, time stamp 4225 through 4303.

Counsel, it's at page 21, lines 2 through

8 12.

9 MS. POLK: Same objection, Judge.

MR. LI: I think the tone matters, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Overruled.

12 You may play that excerpt.

13 (Exhibit 644 played.)

14 Q. BY MR. LI: Ms. Gennari, is it fair to

15 say that you told the people who were helping

16 people out of the sweat lodge that you said no?

17 I'm fine? I'm fine?

A. I was trying to get them to take the

19 other people first.

Q. Ms. Gennari, I'm asking you a simplequestion. Is it true that you said to the people

22 who were helping people out of the sweat lodge, no?

23 I'm fine? I'm fine?

24 A. Yes.

Q. Is it fair to say that before this

158

- I lawsuit that you filed in September of 2010, you
- 2 had never mentioned to the police or to anybody
- 3 else that you had blacked out?
- 4 A. I don't know.
- 5 Q. You did not mention it to the police, did
- 6 you?
- 7 A. Not in those early interviews.
- 8 Q. You didn't?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Okay. Did you mention it later in a
- 11 separate interview to the police?
- 12 A. I have no idea.
- 13 Q. How many times have you met with the
- 14 police?
- 15 A. I don't know.
- 16 Q. One, two, three four, five times?
- 17 A. I don't know.
- 18 Q. You have no idea whether it's one or
- 19 five?
- 20 A. I know it's not one. I don't think it's

21 five. I don't know. Everything was very foggy for

22 a lot of months after this.

- **Q.** And during those one to five times that
- 24 you met with the police, did you tell them that you
- 25 had blacked out?

A. I den't know.

Q. Is it fair to say that before you filed

this lawsuit on September 2010, you had said to

4 others that you were okay, that you were doing

5 fine?

1

2

6 A. Well, that day I thought I was doing 7 fine. And that's what I told them.

8 Q. And on October 27th when you were

9 interviewed by a detective with the Yavapai County

10 Sheriff's Office, you said that you had been fine;

11 correct?

12 A. I repeated that I had told everybody I

13 was fine.

14 Q. And, in fact, you said you had been fine;

15 correct?

18

22

25

2

5

6

12

15

18

23

24

25

16 A. I thought I was.

17 Q. You didn't mention blacking out?

A. I didn't know that yet.

19 Q. And you knew that this was part of a

20 homicide investigation -- a criminal homicide

21 investigation; correct?

A. Yes.

23 Q. And you did not tell the sheriffs that

24 you had blacked out; correct?

A. I don't think so.

1 MR. LI: Thank you, Ms. Gennari.

THE COURT: Redirect?

3 MS. POLK: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

4 May I proceed, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

7 BY MS. POLK:

8 Q. Ms. Gennari, I'm going to hand you

9 Exhibit 645, which is the transcript of the

10 interview that Mr. Li was playing excerpts from.

11 Let me leave that with you.

A. Okay.

13 Q. Let's start by going to page 7, lines 1

14 through 7.

A. All right.

16 Q. Let me ask you, first of all, do you know

17 how long this interview lasted for?

A. No. It wasn't all that long.

19 Q. Where were you when this interview took

20 place?

21 A. Let's see. October 27th I would have

22 been at home on the couch.

- Q. And where was Detective Willingham?
- A. No idea. Other end of the phone.
 - Q. Was she there?

- Α. No.
- 2 Q. Was this interview on the telephone?
- Α. Yes.
- Q. And do you see on the caption it says,
- length, one minute -- or one hour, three minutes
- 6 lona?

1

8

- 7 Α. Yes.
 - Q. Does that sound about right to you?
- 9 Α. Yeah.
- 10 Can you recount the events of the entire
- 11 week, including the events in the sweat lodge, in
- 12 one hour to anybody?
- 13 Α. Not likely. Not with extreme details.
- 14 Q. And you just said that you were most
- likely on the couch. Why do you think most likely 15
- 16 on October 27, which is less than 20 days after
- your experience in Mr. Ray's sweat lodge -- why are 17
- 18 you saying most likely you are on the couch?
- 19 When I got home -- when I left Angel
- 20 Valley, the people there had told me if I was still
- 21 feeling off or strange or not quite right when I
- got home that I needed to go see a doctor. And so 22
- 23 I woke up at home still feeling not right, and I
- 24 took myself into urgent care. Urgent care gave me
- fluids. 25

- 162
- MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor. We don't have 1
- 2 any medical records from this.
- THE COURT: Overruled. 3
- THE WITNESS: Did whatever that test is where 4
- 5 they put stickers all over you to see what your
- heart is up to. And then they made me call a 6
- friend to drive me across the street to the 7
- 8 emergency room where they did a bunch more tests to
- 9 me. And I saw my own doctor, and I was having
- 10 problems breathing. I was very --
- 11 Q. BY MS. POLK: And give us a time frame.
- How soon after your experience in Mr. Ray's sweat 12
- 13 lodge ceremony are you talking about that you were
- having trouble breathing? 14
- 15 A. This would have been Sunday that I took
- 16 myself to Urgent Care.
- Q. Sunday following the Thursday that you 17
- 18 were in the --

19

21

24

- Yes.
- 20 Q. -- tent?
 - Α. Yes.
- 22 Q. Okay. And what happened between Thursday
- 23 and Sunday in terms of your physical condition?
 - Well, Thursday --
- MR. LI: Your Honor, I apologize. If I can 25

- just get the date. When exactly are we talking 1
- 2 about?

6

- BY MS. POLK: What happened between 3
- Thursday, October 8, 2009, and Sunday -- you're 4
- 5 saying the Sunday immediately following?
 - Α. Yes.
- 7 Q. And what happened in terms of your
- physical condition? 8
- Thursday night after the sweat lodge I 9
- went up to dinner along with everybody else and was 10
- not feeling well. I described I was cold and 11
- shaking, but my skin was giving off heat. I think 12
- as much to convince myself as anything, I thought, 13
- oh. Yeah. It's just like a bad sunburn. This 14
- 15 will go away.
- And the next day I was slow and weak. 16
- And I thought, well, we're all in shock. So 17
- 18 that -- I'm still thinking, okay. That's
- 19 explainable.
- And then the following morning -- or that 20
- night, rather, they had a gathering of all of us. 21
- And they brought in -- I forget who she is. I 22
- 23 quess she's a channeler.
 - MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance
- 25 about channeling.
 - THE COURT: Sustained.
 - THE WITNESS: But we were all gathered, at any
- 3 rate.

24

1

2

- MR. LI: Your Honor, there is no question 4
- 5 pending.
- 6 THE COURT: There is not a question
- 7 currently --
- 8 MS. POLK: Well, I can ask it. There is a
- question, which is what happened in terms of her 9
- 10 physical condition?
- 11 Q. And you're now talking about Friday?
 - Α. Friday night.
- 13 So on Friday, were you still at Angel
- 14 Valley?

12

15

18

19

- A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And you had planned originally to stay
- that Friday night there as well? 17
 - Α. Yes.
 - Q. And Friday night how were you feeling?
- 20 Friday night while we were all gathered,
 - I started to feel dizzy, and my chest felt like it
- was being cracked open. And at one point, I ended 22
- up -- I had them put me on the floor because I
- 23
- 24 thought I was just going to go out. Go out meaning what?
- 25

8

9

10

23

166

1 Pass out. So they put me on the floor. And once I thought I could sit up, they started --2 3 they started pouring electrolytes down me.

Q. And who are they?

5 Α. They were the Angel Valley staff who were there.

Q. Was anybody from James Ray International attending to you?

MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance.

10 THE COURT: Overruled.

You may answer that if you can.

12 THE WITNESS: I don't believe so. No.

13 Q. BY MS. POLK: And let me just back you

14 up, Ms. Gennari, to ask you this question: You

were in Mr. Ray's sweat lodge ceremony the entire 15

16 time?

4

6

7

8 9

11

18

21

24

5

17 Α. Yes.

Q. And in terms of the 50-something

19 participants inside that sweat lodge, where were

20 you in terms of the order of leaving?

A. I was, I guess, second to last. The last 22 person out was dragged by whoever the two people

23 were dragging the last person.

Q. And yet afterwards when emergency

25 responders had come to the scene, you were never

taken to a paramedic at that time? 1

2 A. No.

MR. LI: Objection. Leading. 3

4 THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. BY MS. POLK: Did anybody -- did Mr. Ray

6 ever come to you to check on you --

7 MR. LI: Objection, Relevance.

Q. BY MS. POLK: -- being --8

9 MR. LI: Sorry.

10 THE COURT: Sustained.

11 Q. BY MS. POLK: Did anybody from James Ray

International or the defendant check on you after 12

13 that sweat lodge ceremony was over?

14 MR. LI: Objection. Relevance.

15 THE COURT: Sustained.

16 BY MS. POLK: Did you see any -- did you

17 get any medical attention on Thursday at any time

18 after the sweat lodge ceremony was over?

19 A. No.

20 Q. Did anybody ever direct you to get

medical attention that night? 21

22 MR. LI: Objection. Form of the question.

23 Relevance.

25

24 THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: I recall somebody asking me if I

wanted to go to the hospital. At the time I had 1

come up with plausible explanations for how I felt

and didn't -- and also really, really didn't want 3

to end my vacation in the hospital. 4

Q. BY MS. POLK: Okay. So now we're up to

6 Friday night. And you started to tell the jury

7 you're at a gathering. You feel dizzy?

> Α. Yeah.

Q. And what happens?

Well, I felt dizzy. I felt like I Α.

couldn't move my arms and legs. I asked them to 11

put me on the floor. And they lowered me down to 12

the floor. And I was there for a while. And then 13

the Angel Valley staff brought me liquids and 14

15 started just having me guzzle liquids with

16 electrolytes.

17 And then the cook put together some concoction. It was really strange and ugly. And 18

she said, you're going to drink that all night 19

long. When you finish one, you start the next one. 20

21 You just keep drinking that all night long. And I

22 did, which --

And did it help?

Yes. That was -- that eased the pain in 24 Α.

my chest and made me -- I was still shaky. But I

168

wasn't in danger of dropping in my tracks, at least 1

2 that's how I felt.

3 And then in the morning I managed a

little bit of breakfast. I was still feeling woozy 4

and still being very careful about where I put my 5

eyes and how I focused on things and not looking at 6

moving objects. And the shuttle to the airport was 7

a challenge. I had to keep focusing so that I 8

wouldn't get dizzy. 9

10 And I got to the airport and got myself 11 the most gigantic hamburger I could find. I was

just dying for some, quote, unquote, real food. 12

13 And I finally got -- I got home. I went out to the

local drugstore and got some Pedialyte and started 14

chugging that, just continuing the electrolytes and 15

fluids, electrolytes and fluids. I drank that all 16

17 night.

19

21

22

18 What is Pedialyte?

MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance.

THE WITNESS: I don't know. 20

THE COURT: Overruled. The answer stands.

THE WITNESS: On Sunday morning I was still

23 feeling -- I still didn't feel good. And I thought

24 that that's been too many days. Clearly I have not

25 recovered. So I took myself into Urgent Care.

169

Q. BY MS. POLK: And what tests did they do on you at Urgent Care?

MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor. We don't have records on this. It's a disclosure issue.

THE COURT: I do need to see counsel, please. (Sidebar conference.)

THE COURT: Okay. Just the whole line and the detail. I know there was some testimony about that on cross about feeling fine and things like that.

But your objection?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

19

21

23

24

25

2

5

6

7

8

16

11 MR. LI: Your Honor, first of all, it's all hearsay. We don't have any medical records 12 13 relating to this. In fact, what she tells the 14 detective, which I didn't go into because the medical issue wasn't part of it, is that she says 15 16 that there was no diagnosis of heat stroke. She didn't talk about heat at all. There was some 17 issue perhaps with dehydration. 18

The real issue, Your Honor, the state's 20 going to ask this witness to, basically, give her diagnosis. And we don't have any records on it. 22 We don't have any way to cross it. It's literally just whatever she says. And that's a disclosure problem.

THE COURT: Ms. Polk, specifically relevant to

what aspect of cross?

MS. POLK: It's relevant to two aspects.

First of all, Mr. Li attempted to establish that 3

she was feeling fine --4

THE COURT: That's what I mentioned.

MS. POLK: -- and that she is now making up all these other issues. And, in fact, there is

going to be quite a bit of testimony about how she

9 continues not to feel fine, and she goes to the

doctor. And I don't have records on it either, 10

Your Honor. Ultimately, she files a lawsuit. 11

12 So there is two issues. One is to 13 directly rebut the suggestion that she's making up

the fact that she got sick, to counter that, but 14

15 also the lawsuit itself.

> Mr. Li has opened the door to the facts underlying her reasons for filing the lawsuit.

17 It's based on what she learns, then, from the 18

doctor. And there is significant health issues

19

that continue to follow her for many months, 11 20 21

months, as Mr. Li constantly repeated in front of

22 the jury, that lead her to file that lawsuit.

23 That door has been opened.

24 THE COURT: Mr. Li?

MR. LI: Your Honor, I disagree. Among other

things, it's the state's obligation, one, to find 1

this lawsuit. But more importantly, we don't have

any disclosure relating to what her medical

4 condition is. There is no way to -- she's just

going to say whatever she says. We don't have any

records. The state could have found the records. 6

7 They found records for everybody else, all the

other people who are going to come in here and 8

testify about their various medical conditions and 9

what have you. They're supported by specific a 10

doctor's finding.

11

17

18

20

21

170

This is a witness who has said a lot of 12 things that, frankly, Your Honor, with all due 13 respect, it's just untrue. And that's the purpose 14 of cross-examination is to show -- demonstrate the 15 places where the witness is not telling the truth. 16

One example, for instance, is all the various allegations in the lawsuit that she filed.

19 There is no way to cross --

MS. POLK: Which Mr. Li opened the door to.

This witness can testify as to her

reasons for filing the lawsuit, what her physical 22 condition was, what her emotional condition was, 23

and how that develops over the next few months 24

25 leading to filing the lawsuit.

172

Your Honor, Mr. Li has repeatedly talked 1

about the state's obligation. The law does not

require the state to go out and find in California 3

a lawsuit that was filed. The state did not know

that this witness had filed a lawsuit. The defense 5

intended to use it, did not disclose it to us, and

7 the Court allowed it. I'm now allowed fair

redirect to establish why she filed the lawsuit. 8

He has suggested that there is 9 allegations in that lawsuit that are not true. And 10 I'm allowed to develop and find out what the basis 11

is for those allegations that are in the lawsuit. 12

13 MR. LI: She actually admits there are

14 allegations in the lawsuit that are untrue. It's

not just that I'm saying it. She admits it that 15

it's untrue. That's the purpose of 16

cross-examination. 17

THE COURT: Really -- it's really two 18 different questions. That's what I'm having 19 difficulty with. Someone feels they're injured, 20 something happened, and then the question of 21

liability and what they might say to say there is 22

liability. They're not necessarily connected. And 23

24 I --

25

MS. POLK: Mr. Li connected the two in trying

And after that visit with your own

25

that. Obviously, the rules of evidence would still

5

8

- 1 doctor, did you continue to see a doctor?
 - A. Yes.

2

6

7

9

10

11

25

2

- Q. And without telling us what the doctor
 was telling you, over what period of time did you
 continue to see a doctor?
 - A. I was in at least once a week for the next five or six weeks. And then it stretched out a little bit, like two weeks. But almost into -- sometime in that first week, my doctor wrote me a note to be on disability. But she wanted to see me every week.
- Q. And let's talk about that for a moment.
 You've told the jury that you were employed and you
 were at a company. Did you end up not being able
 to go to work?
- 16 A. Yes.
- **17 Q.** For what period of time?
- 18 A. I was completely off for three weeks.
- 19 And then I was on half time for two weeks.
- Q. What were the symptoms you wereexperiencing during those three weeks?
- A. Mostly that I was having a lot of trouble breathing. Even walking down the hall to the bathroom would make me out of breath.
 - **Q.** Did there come a time when you were able
- 1 to return to work full time?
 - A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And when was that?
- 4 A. Three weeks off and two weeks of half 5 time, and then I went to full time.
- **Q.** Were you also having emotional issues?
- 7 MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance.
- 8 Leading.
- 9 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 10 You may answer that.
- 11 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- **Q.** BY MS. POLK: And describe those for the
- 13 jury. Would you.
- 14 A. I would -- I spent a lot of time crying.
- 15 Random things would remind me or would trigger a
- 16 memory of the sweat lodge, and I'd just go to
- 17 pieces. I couldn't remember what I was doing half
- 18 the time. I'd find myself in a room and have no
- 19 idea how I got there or why. Or I'd be carrying
- 20 something and I didn't know why I picked it up or
- 21 what I wanted with that object. It was like my
- 22 brain shut down.
- **Q.** What was the length of the relationship
- 24 that you had with Mr. Ray and his events?
- 25 A. A couple of years.

- 1 Q. And why would you just randomly break out
- 2 crying after you had been in his sweat lodge?
- 3 MR. LI: Objection. Relevance.
- 4 THE COURT: Sustained.
 - Q. BY MS. POLK: You were asked questions by
- 6 Mr. Li where you indicated immediately following
- 7 the sweat lodge, you were saying you were fine?
 - MR. LI: Objection. Misstates the testimony.
- 9 The interview was from October 27, which was about
- 10 three weeks after the medical things that this
- 11 witness is discussing.
- 12 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 13 Q. BY MS. POLK: You were asked questions by
- 14 Mr. Li about the interview that took place about
- 15 three weeks after you were in Mr. Ray's sweat lodge
- 16 ceremony and some specific questions and answers
- 17 that you gave at that time. And I want to direct
- 18 your attention to -- you have that transcript in
- 19 front of you?

20

21

24

25

3

178

- A. Yes.
 - Q. Look at page 7, first of all. First of
- 22 all, have you had a chance to ever sit down and
- 23 read this entire transcript of the interview?
 - A. No.
 - Q. And looking at page 7, you recall that
 - 1 Mr. Li played a clip that had lines 1 through 7?
- 2 Do you recall that clip being played for you?
 - A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Could you go back to page 6. And
- 5 starting at line 21, would you read that.
- 6 MR. LI: Your Honor, misstates the testimony.
- 7 Actually, the clip started at line 22 and played
- 8 all the way through the next page at line 7.
- an the way through the next page at mic
- 9 THE COURT: Ms. Polk?
- MS. POLK: Your Honor, my notes indicate that
- 11 there was a clip played from page 7.
- MR. LI: Your Honor, we can simply play the
- 13 clip?

19

21

- 14 THE COURT: Is that what you're suggesting,
- 15 Ms. Polk?
- 16 MS. POLK: No, Your Honor. I want to
- 17 specifically ask her a question. And let me direct
- 18 the question.
 - THE COURT: Okay.
- 20 MS. POLK: But I'd like to give the witness a
 - moment, if I may, to actually read her own words.
- 22 THE COURT: Yes.
- 23 MS. POLK: Okay.
 - Q. So what I'd like you to do, Ms. Gennari,
- 5 is look at page 6, read through the bottom of

- 1 page 6 and then through page 7. The give you a
- 2 moment.
- 3 A. Okay.
- **Q.** Have you had a moment to read through
- 5 that?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. You were asked specifically by Mr. Li why
- 8 you never told anyone you blacked out?
- 9 A. Yes.
- Q. And having read through that portion,
- 11 page 6 to page 7, of your transcript, what do you
- 12 recall telling the detective about what you did
- 13 immediately following the end of the sweat lodge
- 14 ceremony?
- 15 A. That when it ended and the door opened, I
- 16 just stayed still and that there was a discussion
- 17 about which row should go. And I just still
- 18 didn't -- I was still lying there.
- 19 MR. LI: Your Honor, I'd move to strike all of
- 20 this. She's simply paraphrasing what the
- 21 transcript is. And we've actually played this
- 22 exact tape. And I'd move to strike all of that.
- 23 THE COURT: Sustained.
 - Q. BY MS. POLK: Ms. Gennari, when you told
- 25 the detective that, well, I finally -- I opened my
- 182
- 1 eyes and I saw there was no one to my right --
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. -- what do you remember about the period
- 4 of time that your eyes were closed?
 - A. Nothing. From the time that there was
- 6 the front row, back row, then there is a big blank
- 7 spot in my memory from there until when I opened my
- 8 eyes.

24

5

- **Q.** And when you were interviewed by the
- 10 detective, did the detective ask you follow-up
- 11 questions about the period of time that your eyes
- 12 were closed?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. And, again, that interview was just an
- 15 hour long?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Would you draw on here your final
- 18 position in Mr. Ray's sweat lodge ceremony before
- 19 that last --
- 20 A. I was about there.
 - Q. Okay. Show the jury how participants
- 22 were told to exit if they had to get out between
- 23 rounds.

21

- 24 And given your position up here, in what
- 25 order should you have left Mr. Ray's sweat lodge

- 1 when it was over
- 2 A. I should have been right after the JRI
- 3 team that was sitting in here.
- 4 Q. Do you have any idea how long it took
- 5 participants to get out of that tent when it was
- 6 over?

7

8

10

- A. No idea.
- Q. Do you have any idea how many people were
- 9 still in for that last round?
 - A. No idea.
- 11 Q. Do you have any recall today of other
- **12** people leaving?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. What's the last thing you remember before
- 15 you closed your eyes?
- 16 A. My eyes were closed from the time I hit
- 17 the dirt down there. And while they were closed,
- 18 the last thing I recall was hearing, front row,
- 19 back row. You need to leave in an orderly fashion.
- 20 And my brain was amusing itself with wondering
- 21 which row I was in.
- 22 Q. You don't remember anything after that?
- 23 A. No.

24

4

5

- Q. Do you know what went first, the front
- 25 row or the back row?
- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. Do you have any memory of people crawling
- 3 over you or around you?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Have you passed out in your life before
- 6 being in Mr. Ray's sweat lodge ceremony?
- 7 A. Once.
- 8 Q. And how long ago was that?
- 9 A. '91, '92, somewhere in there.
- 10 Q. And on October 8th of 2009, when you were
- 11 in this structure and it had ended, tell the jury
- 12 what your next memory is.
- 13 A. It ended. There was the discussion of
- 14 which row, and then there is a big blank spot in my
- 15 memory. And the next thing I remember was the
- 16 woman picking up my hand.
- 17 Q. Do you know how many minutes had passed
- 18 since you blacked out until you feel a woman
- 19 grabbing up your hand?
 - A. No.
 - Q. When that woman was there pulling at your
- 22 arm, did you look around the tent?
- 23 A. A little bit. Yeah.
 - Q. And tell the jury what you saw then.
 - A. I saw some people behind me trying to

20

21

24

1 drag somebody out.

- Behind you? Point on here. What do you 2
- 3 mean behind you?
- Α. They were kind of over in this area.
- 5 Q. Do you know who it was that was being 6 dragged out?
- 7 Α. No, I don't.
- 8 Q. Do you know who the people were that were
- 9 trying to drag somebody out?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. What direction were they trying to drag
- 12 somebody out?
- 13 A. I don't know. They were trying to get --
- 14 they were working on getting handholds when I
- 15 glanced over my shoulder. And then she got my
- 16 attention again and said, they're going to take
- 17 some time. Let's go. Let's get you out.
- 18 Did you notice anybody else in the tent
- 19 at that time?
- 20 A. No.
- Q. 21 Do you believe there was anybody else in
- 22 the tent?
- 23 Α. I don't think so.
- 24 Q. Do you believe it had been cleared out
- except for you and one other person? 25
- 186

- 1 Α. Yeah.
- 2 Q. Did you notice at that time whether or
- 3 not the back of the lodge had been opened up?
- 4 Α. I don't remember it being open at that
- 5 point.
- 6 And then Mr. Li played a clip. And If I
- 7 could direct your attention to page 21. If you'll
- 8 look at lines 1 through 9.
- 9 And that's where you stated during that
- 10 interview with the detective, well, I got -- I
- 11 think there were -- I think there were two people
- 12 dragging another person behind me because I let the
- 13 first dragged person go in front of me. And then
- 14 I -- when the person outside came back to the door,
- 15 I said, no. I'm fine. I'm fine. Get that person.
- 16 That's more important. They need help.
- 17 Do you recall making that statement? As
- 18 you sit here on the stand, do you recall making
- 19 that statement when you were in the sweat lodge?
- 20 Kind of. I remember seeing the person 21 behind me and thinking they looked more important
- 22 and that they should get them out first.
- 23 Q. And what do you mean "they looked more
- 24 important"?
- 25 Like, I had my eyes open and was at least

- looking around under my own power. And that person
- was not.

1

3

5

7

17

1

2

8

18

19

- Q. Was that person male or female?
- Α. I don't know.
- Did that person have their eyes opened or Q.
- 6 closed?
 - I don't know. It was an impression that Α.
- that was somebody who looked worse than I felt. 8
- 9 Do you recall today, as you testify, what
- about that person, about the way they looked, made 10
- you think they were worse off than you were? 11
- 12 Well, people were trying to get handholds
- on the person, and the person wasn't helping, was 13
- 14 like a rag doll.
- 15 Q. Did you ever notice outside what happened
- 16 to that person?
 - Α. I don't know.
- When that ceremony ended, you talked 18 Q.
- 19 about blacking out and then being woken up. What
- was your state of mind in terms of alertness after 20
- 21 you were woken up?
- MR. LI: Objection. Leading, form of the 22
- 23 question.

dazed.

- 24 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 25 You may answer that.
 - 188
 - THE WITNESS: I was not very -- I was pretty
- 3 BY MS. POLK: Then you were asked some
- 4 questions by Mr. Li about your position in the
- 5 sweat lodge when you were close to the area of Liz
- Neuman and whether you remember a conversation 6
- 7 between Liz Neuman and Laura Tucker.
- - Do you recall that line of questioning?
- 9 Α. Yes.
- 10 If I can direct your attention to page 4
- 11 of your transcript. And if you will look at lines
- 23 through 28. 12
- 13 MR. LI: Your Honor, technically the state
- 14 needs to ask a question. And then if the witness
- 15 needs to have his or her recollection refreshed,
- then they look at the transcript. This is 16
- 17 technically not correct.
 - THE COURT: Overruled.
 - You may examine the transcript.
- 20 Q. BY MS. POLK: Did you see that portion?
- 21 Α. Yes.
- 22 And in the portion that Mr. Li played the Q.
- 23 audio from, if you will look at page 5 beginning on
- 24 line 1. If you will just look at that to refresh
- your recollection. 25

A. Yes.

1

5

7

8

9

10

11

2 Q. And if you will go back to page 4 and read for the jury what you said at lines 23 through 4 28.

MR. LI: Your Honor, that's not -- I mean, I have no understanding of what part of the evidence code allows the witness to just read a transcript.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take the afternoon recess at this time. Please remember the admonition. Please be back in the jury room at five after. That's about 20 minutes.

12 And then, Ms. Gennari, you're also 13 excused for the recess as well.

14 I'm going to ask the parties to remain a moment. 15

16 Thank you.

17 (Proceedings continued outside presence

of jury.) 18

19 THE COURT: I don't have the transcript. So,

20 Ms. Polk, if I could ask --

21 MR. LI: Your Honor, may I approach?

22 THE COURT: Thank you.

23 The excerpt and the purpose of your

offering it. 24

25

MS. POLK: Your Honor, counsel played from

page 5 the excerpt at the top of the page. And at

that time I had asked under Rule 106 that he play

an expanded audio, and the Court indicated that on

redirect I could address it. And that's what I'm

5 doing now.

6 THE COURT: And I'm looking at the -- there are some notes here that --7

MR. LI: They're my notes. 8

THE COURT: Says clip 1 and clip 2. And 9

you're referring to the top of page 5 the -- lines 10

4 through 9? 11

12 MS. POLK: Yes, Your Honor.

13 THE COURT: And you're proposing to also

14 play --

23

15 MS. POLK: I'd like to play -- or not play.

Just have her read from page 4, lines 23 to 28. 16

MR. LI: Your Honor, if I may be heard? 17

18 THE COURT: Of course. I just want to see

what we're talking about first, Mr. Li. 19

20 MR. LI: The line of questioning related to

the tone of her voice and whether she told the 21

detective that when Liz Neuman said no, no, no, 22

her whether or not she had told the detective that 24

Liz Neuman sounded drunk. And that was the limited 25

that she sounded drunk, et cetera. And I had asked

cross-examination impeachment that we used that clip for.

3 It does not -- Rule 106 does not require the entire rest of the conversation because none of 4

the rest of the conversation has anything to do 5

with whether or not that particular witness told

Detective Willingham on October 27 that Liz Neuman 7

sounded drunk when she said no, no, no. 8

9 That was my line of questioning. It was also directed towards the tone of her voice when 10 she told Detective Willingham about this exchange 11 between Laura Tucker and Liz Neuman. It did not 12 have anything to do with the various issues 13

discussed in the earlier pages. 14 15 Moreover, just simply having the witness

16 read aloud her transcript is not proper.

THE COURT: Well, it could be depending on 18 context and ---

MR. LI: I guess I would submit not in this context. Simply to just -- you know -- the only questions that were being asked related to whether or not she had told Detective Willingham that Liz Neuman had said no, no, no, in a drunken tone.

23 And I played the tape to show what she 24 25

actually told Detective Willingham about Liz

190

17

19

20

21

22

Neuman's statement and also the tone she used to 1

describe Liz Neuman's statements.

It had nothing to do with the prior 3 business relating to where people were sitting and 4

where Laura Tucker was sitting and whether -- you 5

know -- whether people moved around in different 6

7 positions and what have you.

There was a very limited purpose behind 8 the cross-examination. And that's why we played, I 9 10 think, a few seconds.

11 THE COURT: Ms. Polk?

MS. POLK: Well, two points, Your Honor. The 12 first being that the defense never provided to the 13 state any audio clips. We provided audio clips to 14 the defense. We gave them an opportunity to ask 16 that we expand them. And when they requested it,

18 These clips were not provided to the 19 state in advance, and so my opportunity to actually play the audio clip as opposed to reading from the 20 transcript simply isn't there. And it is

21

appropriate for me to have the witness look at the 22

transcript of that audio to have her explain the 23

24 context of an audio.

we did it.

17

The second point is that Mr. Li is

1

correct. He did try to make a point that her no, no, no, in the audio was different from her no, no, no, on the stand. But then he went on to make the 3 second point, which was that Ms. Gennari did not know that Liz was dying and asked her several questions about that.

7 That expanded clip is the context for why 8 Ms. Gennari did not know that Liz Neuman was dying, 9 which was that she was really kind of foggy. She looked up. She sees Liz doesn't look good. She 10 does a check on herself, and then she goes back to 11 12 herself. I was 100 percent hanging on to me. That 13 was not played. They began the clip at the end of 14 round 7. And so that's the context that the state is entitled to bring out on redirect. 15 16

MR. LI: Two points, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes. 17

6

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

20

21

22

23

24

MR. LI: One is the state, when they provided the clips, were moving clips into evidence on direct examination. And those clips over our objection have been entered into evidence. What we do on cross-examination, we

23 literally could have just -- you know -- gotten it 24 at the time stamp and played it, which is,

25 essentially, what we did.

> And the state -- you know -- has the exact same -- I mean, this is cross-examination and impeachment. We don't know necessarily what the witness is going to say, whether they're going to deny having made those statements or anything like that.

The second point is -- you know -- there is no rule of 106 relating to this particular clip because all we're talking about is the tone of voice when she said no, no, no, in describing Miss Neuman's conversation with Laura Tucker.

With respect to why Ms. Gennari didn't know that Liz Neuman was dying, that's not our 13 14 point. We're not blaming anybody. The only point we're making is that nobody knew. And Ms. Neuman 15 16 didn't know. Ms. Tucker didn't know. Mr. Caci didn't know. Nobody knew. Ms. Phillips right from 17 the beginning of the case talking about other --18 the two other decedents didn't know. 19

That's the only point we're making is that folks didn't know who were sitting right next to the people who died. And that's all. We're not blaming anyone. We're not saying they're liable, they're bad. And so no explanation is necessary to explain why somebody didn't know. The fact is they

didn't know. Nobody knew. 1

2 THE COURT: The excerpt that the state proposes is really consistent with what has been testified to on direct. The question of 4

Miss Gennari's observations of Liz Neuman came up

on cross. And that's a legitimate area of 6

7 redirect. It's not necessary or appropriate to expand the -- this particular excerpt. 8

9 But you can go into that on redirect, 10 Ms. Polk.

But I don't -- this has been testified to 11 with regard to one particular point that related to 12 that excerpt. It doesn't really fill out the 13 14 context --

MS. POLK: But, Your Honor --15

16 THE COURT: Yes.

MS. POLK: Mr. Li has said the context was no, 17 no, no. At least that's what he's saying in court 18 now. At the time he played it, he said the no, no, 19 no, and then went right into what she observed. 20

The state has through witnesses pointed 21 out that witnesses who are close to the victims 22 were themselves very impaired. And that is 23 consistent with this witness also being impaired, 24

25 unlike Mr. Ray who was not impaired.

So it's not an issue of because this

witness couldn't perceive that Ms. Neuman was dying 2 that Mr. Ray, therefore, could not perceive that. 3

That's a completely different issue. 4

And what Mr. Li established with the clip 5 and then went right into questioning was that you 6 didn't perceive that she was dying. And the full 7 context of that clip is that she was impaired. She 8 was foggy. Here's what she heard at the time. 9

MR. LI: Your Honor, actually -- I mean, I 10 have an outline of my questioning and where I went 11 next with another statement that this witness made 12 about how you're not inside somebody's body and you 13 14 can't hook them up to a computer like they do with 15 cars.

And we spent probably a few minutes on 16 that issue, not before we went right to the sort of 17 whether you're impaired or not. I mean, the 18 question was -- we went right into her statement 19 that she had made to the detective about almost --20 you know -- she's an intelligent lady. 21

It's almost -- you know -- sort of an 22 existential point. You don't know what other 23 people are feeling. And that's not -- I mean, I 24 think the Court is correct that if the state wants 25

- to ask questions about her mentar state, they've
 already done it but they can do it some more. I
 don't think it's appropriate to have this witness
 simply just read back her transcript.
- THE COURT: And, of course, the state's
 concern is the implication that might be left if
 this wasn't discussed with the officer at the time.
- 8 MS. POLK: Correct.
- 9 THE COURT: That's the point. And you're --
- MR. LI: The state could just simply say, you
- 11 told that to the detective. That would be fine.
- 12 THE COURT: And that's -- since it is
- 13 consistent with what was indicated before Ms. Polk,
- 14 you can cross-examine on this. To play the other
- 15 point of the -- the other part of the transcript,
- 16 no. I stand on that ruling. You can go into it on
- 17 redirect and clear up if that was stated with the
- 18 officer at the time also.
- 19 Thank you.
- 20 MR. LI: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 21 THE COURT: We'll be in recess.
- 22 (Recess.)
- 23 (Proceedings continued in the presence of
- 24 jury.)
- 25 THE COURT: The record will show the presence
 - of Mr. Ray, the attorneys, the jury. And
- 2 Ms. Gennari is on the witness stand.
- 3 Ms. Polk, when you're ready, you may
- 4 continue with redirect.
- **5** MS. POLK: Thank you, Your Honor.
- **Q.** Ms. Gennari, will you look at page 5 of
- 7 the transcript of your interview with
- 8 Detective Willingham on October 27th of 2009. And
- 9 I'll direct your attention to the lines beginning
- 10 with 1 through 6.
- 11 Do you recall when Mr. Li played that
- 12 audio for the jury of that portion of your
- 13 interview?

- A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And you recall inside the sweat lodge
- 16 when Liz Neuman was asked, do you want to leave --
- 17 tell the jury in your words, using the tone that
- 18 you heard Liz Neuman use, how did she respond.
- 19 A. She said, no, no, no. She sounded drunk
- 20 to me.
- **Q.** And at the time, did it seem to you that
- 22 she sounded drunk. Or what do you recall thinking
- 23 at the time?
- A. Well, what I recall thinking is exactly
 what I told Detective Willingham, was I knew it was

- her fifth time doing this. I thought, well, she
- 2 knows what she's doing. She understands this
- 3 situation better than I do.
- 4 Q. Did you believe that Liz Neuman was dying
- 5 at that time?

6

7

8

13

198

- A. No.
 - Q. Did you even think about it?
- A. No. It never crossed my mind.
- **9 Q.** And at that time what was your mental
- 10 condition?
- 11 A. I was just really trying to focus, really
- 12 trying to hang on to myself.
 - Q. During this interview with
- 14 Detective Willingham, did you tell her what your
- 15 mental condition at the time was?
- 16 A. Well, right before -- you know -- I said
- 17 I was 100 percent hanging on to me.
- 18 Q. And looking back at the bottom of
- 19 page 4 --
- 20 A. Yeah. I looked at Liz and thought she
- 21 didn't look good. And then I checked in with
- 22 myself and realized there was nothing I could do
- 23 about that. I didn't have enough left.
- 24 Q. Have you ever pushed yourself like you
- 25 were pushed in the sweat lodge?

200

- 1 A. I suppose there are times where I've
- 2 pushed myself, not to the point where I was that
- 3 uncomfortable, though.
- **Q.** Will you look at page 17 of that
- 5 transcript.
- 6 And do you recall when Mr. Li played the
- 7 audio clip involving that meditation, the
- 8 breathwork?
- 9 A. Yeah.
- 10 Q. Let me direct your attention to page 17,
- 11 lines 6 through 14.
- 12 A. Yes.
- **Q.** And you were asked that question
- 14 specifically about your statement to
- 15 Detective Willingham. All I'd have to do is open
- 16 my eyes and look around the room and I'd be back to
- 17 myself.

18

- Do you recall that question?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. If I can direct your attention to
- 21 page 16, lines 19 through 24, and just have you
- 22 look at that for a moment.
- 23 A. Yes.
 - Q. What did you tell Detective Willingham
- 25 during this same interview about what that

1

2

18

19

20

21

25

7

8

11

15

16

18

19

breathwork did to you -- did to your mind? 1

MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor. I think the 2 3 state needs to ask a question of the witness, and

4 then if there is a problem, then the transcript

comes in. I don't think she just gets to read from the transcript.

6

7 MS. POLK: Your Honor, I'm not asking her to read from the transcript. I'm asking her to tell the jury what she told Detective Willingham.

10 MR. LI: Just for the record, the last time 11 counsel did that, the witness actually just read 12 from the transcript for literally, like five

13 minutes.

8

9

14

15

19

20

21

5

6

11

21

24

THE COURT: Overruled.

You may proceed, Ms. Polk.

16 BY MS. POLK: What did you tell 17 Detective Willingham during that interview about 18 what that breathwork did to your mind?

That it put me into a weird state and that I thought it was -- I thought it was rather casual and safe because I hadn't seen any problems.

22 Q. You were asked some questions by Mr. Li about Mr. Ray's overall teachings. And you 23 responded that you thought some teachings were 24

25 useful and some not useful. And then you stated

they're pushed that far, when they're overloaded. 3 4 Q. How was it that Mr. Ray overloaded you 5 with teachings? MR. LI: Objection. Relevance, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Overruled. THE WITNESS: He would get into a very 8 rapid-fire delivery with a lot of information 9 coming really fast, I mean, where it was just 10 faster than you could process it. Almost to the 11

learn. And they actually don't -- from what I

read, they actually don't learn very well when

point for me sometimes where I would realize the 12 gears in my head had just sort of stopped and I 13

filled up and tried to catch up. 14

15 BY MS. POLK: And did there come a point later when you tried to process what Mr. Ray had 16 17 taught you, had said?

I actually didn't get back to a lot of those things and look at those teachings again until after the sweat lodge when I was trying to sort out my head.

Q. And later after the sweat lodge when you 22 were trying to sort out what had happened, what did 23 24 you come to realize?

MR. LI: Objection as to the form. I have no

202

you were currently having trouble finding anything

2 useful. I want to ask you some questions about

those teachings. Did Mr. Ray teach you that 3

4 learning occurs on the border of chaos and order?

A. Yes.

Q. And what did that mean?

7 He would say that to us after giving us a 8 lot of information rapid fire to the point where 9 people were kind of overloaded and glazed, that it was more than they could take in. And then he 10

12 MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor. Move to strike on two grounds: One, what other people were 13 14 thinking; and, two, her characterization of why 15 Mr. Rav was doing things.

would say that to justify using that delivery.

16 THE COURT: Sustained.

17 Q. BY MS. POLK: What did you understand about that teaching -- well, let me ask you this: 18 Was that a teaching that you accepted at the time? 19 20 Α. At the time, yes.

Q. And do you accept it today?

Α. 22 No.

Q. 23 And why not?

> A. I've done a little more reading and a

little more investigation into how people actually

1 idea where this is going to go.

> 2 THE COURT: Sustained.

3 BY MS. POLK: You told Mr. Li that at the

time you believed some of the teachings, but 4

currently you're having trouble finding anything 5 6 useful.

Do you find that teaching useful today?

Α. No.

9 Q. And why not?

10 Α. Because it's not true.

What's not true?

12 It's not true that people learn when Α. 13 they're on the edge of chaos in their own minds, 14 when they're overloaded.

Q. And is that not true for you?

Α. That is definitely not true for me.

Did Mr. Ray use a phrase, "keep the 17

goggles on," as part of his teachings?

Α. Yes.

20 MR. LI: Objection. Relevant.

THE COURT: Overruled. 21

22 BY MS. POLK: In what context?

23 It was a story about the NASA study of people wearing goggles that would invert their 24 vision so that they would see everything upside 25

- 1 down. And I don't remember how long it took, but 2 there was something about -- it took a couple of 3 weeks or thereabouts before their brains would compensate and flip the image back over. 4
 - Even though they were wearing these goggles that flipped things, they'd flip it back. And if they took them off for even a little bit of time, they would have to start the 15-day or 15 or whatever break-in period over again.

10 And he used the phrase to encourage us to 11 keep ourselves immersed in his teachings and to not 12 go back to our old way of thinking because -- with 13 the implication being we would have to start over.

14 MR. LI: Objection. Move to strike as to the 15 purpose and my client's intentions behind teaching 16 her various things. Relevance. Move to strike.

17 THE COURT: Well, as to foundation where that 18 came from, I'll sustain only as to foundation on 19 that.

20 BY MS. POLK: And then my next question, 21 Ms. Gennari, was there a period of time that you 22 believed that was one of the teachings of Mr. Ray 23 that you believed?

24 Α. At the time.

25 Q. And currently do you believe it?

You have already testified about the 1

phrase that Mr. Ray used about playing full on. 2

In 2009, in October when you were at Spiritual

Warrior 2009, was that a teaching that you 4

5 accepted?

6

7

8

9

11

18

21

25

1

5

8

9

Α. Yes.

> Q. Do you accept that today?

Α. No.

Q. And why not?

10 MR. LI: Objection. Relevance.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MS. POLK: Do you find that -- you 12 Q. 13 made the statement to Mr. Li's questions that

currently you're having trouble finding anything 14 useful in his teachings. Do you find anything 15

useful in Mr. Ray's teaching to play full on? 16

17 Α. No.

MR. LI: Objection. Relevance.

THE COURT: Overruled. 19

20 You may answer it. And you did.

> Q. BY MS. POLK: And you said no. And why

22 not?

23 MR. LI: Objection. Relevance.

THE COURT: Overruled. 24

THE WITNESS: We learned that phrase in the

206

- Α. No.
 - Q. And why not?
- 3 Α. Well, because further investigation has
- 4 shown me that a lot of --

MR. LI: Your Honor, move to strike as

6 hearsay.

1

2

5

8

11

14

15

21

5

6

7

8

9

- 7 THE COURT: Sustained.
 - BY MS. POLK: Without talking about your

9 investigation, is that one of the teachings that

10 you have trouble finding anything useful in today?

- Α. Yes.
- 12 Q. When you went into Mr. Ray's sweat lodge,
- 13 was that a teaching that you believed?
 - Α.
 - Q. How did that influence your actions in
- 16 Mr. Ray's sweat lodge?
- 17 With the acceptance of that teaching, I 18 also accepted that he knew how things should be done and that I should follow his advice and do 19

20 things his way.

And when he said people were okay and 22 he'd deal with them later, and when he said Liz

23 knew what she was doing, I continued to accept that

24 he knew what he was doing and I should follow what

25 he said.

- context of fully engaging in what he told us to do.
- 2 And now I'm of the opinion that people should -- or
- that I have a much better idea of what is right for 3
- me than somebody else does.
 - BY MS. POLK: In response to a question

from Mr. Li, you said that this has been quite the 6

journey figuring out things in my head. 7

Do you recall?

- Α. Yes.
- 10 Q. What did you mean when you said that?
- The immediate aftermath of the sweat 11
- lodge pretty much shattered me emotionally, 12
- mentally and left me a lot of pieces to pick up. 13
- And as I have been working through the trauma, 14
- working through looking at the chain of events that 15
- led to the sweat lodge, a lot of -- a lot of things 16
- are becoming clear as to how this chain of 17
- events -- how I ended up in this series of events, 18
- 19 how I ended up in the sweat lodge.

20 I'm starting to understand why I acted 21 the way I did. I certainly would much rather be here telling you that I was the person that saved 22 everybody because that would make me feel good. So 23

24

I've had to understand why I was not that person.

And in terms of that process -- your

- process of figuring out why you acced the way you
 did, where were you in that process when you were
- 3 interviewed by Detective Willingham on October 27th
- 4 of 2009?
- 5 A. I hadn't even started. I was still in 6 shock. I was barely functional. I just spent most 7 of my days either sleeping or crying. I didn't 8 have the mental capacity to start figuring out 9 anything at that point in time.
- Q. And tell the jury why you acted like youdid inside the sweat lodge.
- A. Well, I was sleep deprived. I was hungry. I was thirsty. I was way too hot. I was very uncomfortable. And any one of those things leads to bad decisions. But you put all of five together, and you're stuck. You have no chance.
- 17 Q. Did Mr. Ray's teachings of the week18 influence your actions inside the sweat lodge?
- 19 MR. LI: Objection. Leading.
- 20 THE COURT: Sustained.
- Q. BY MS. POLK: What other factors of theevents of Spiritual Warrior 2009 throughout the
- week affected your conduct inside the sweat lodge?
 A. Aside from my own greatly diminished
- 25 mental capacity, I did -- when I looked at Liz, I
- 1 did -- it did run through my mind the phrase, let
- 2 her have her own experience. And that is something
- 3 I had learned from the teachings.
- Q. I'm going to hand you -- Ms. Gennari, I'mgoing to hand you Exhibit 784. Just take a moment
- 6 and look at that document, if you would.
- 7 MR. LI: Your Honor, we'll stipulate to its 8 admission.
- 9 MS. POLK: Your Honor, I'm not moving to admit
- 10 it.
- 11 Q. You were asked questions by Mr. Li about
- a lawsuit that an attorney filed on your behalf; is
- 13 that correct?
- 14 A. Yes
 - Q. Do you recall when that lawsuit was
- 16 filed?

15

21

- 17 A. According to Mr. Li, it was September of
- 18 last year.
- 19 Q. Who prepared the lawsuit?
- 20 A. Bob Bohn, my lawyer.
 - Q. And did you read everything that your
- 22 lawyer put in that lawsuit?
- 23 A. No.
- **Q.** Did you even sign the lawsuit?
- 25 A. No.

- 1 Q. Do you recall how many meetings you had
- 2 with your lawyer before he filed the lawsuit?
- A. One meeting and a few back and forth emails, but not much.
 - Q. And do you know what investigation your
- 6 lawyer conducted before he filed the lawsuit?
 - A. I don't know.
 - Q. Do you know if he hired a private
- 9 investigator, for example?
- 10 A. I don't know.
- 11 Q. And do you know if he interviewed any
- 12 other witnesses who had been at the sweat lodge in
- 13 2009?

5

7

8

14

15

19

24

2

210

- A. I don't know.
- Q. And, Ms. Gennari, your testimony -- your
- 16 presence here at this trial is pursuant to a
- 17 subpoena that the state issued to you; is that
- 18 correct?
 - A. Yes.
- 20 Q. You were asked a question by Mr. Li. I
- 21 think he said to you, did you know that you could
- 22 gain economic advantage in that lawsuit if Mr. Ray
- 23 is found guilty in this case?
 - Did you even know that?
- 25 A. No.
- 1 Q. Do you even know if that's true?
 - A. I don't know.
- 3 Q. Are you a lawyer?
- 4 A. No
- 5 Q. And do you know the legal terms used by
- 6 your lawyer in this lawsuit?
- 7 A. No
- 8 Q. Did that lawsuit influence your testimony
- 9 in this case?
- 10 A. No
- 11 Q. Do you know who the lawsuit was filed
- 12 against?

13

21

- A. No. Not until I read it.
- 14 Q. You did not file a lawsuit, for example,
- 15 against Angel Valley?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 Q. You did not file a lawsuit against the
- 18 person who built the sweat lodge that Mr. Ray
- 19 conducted his ceremony in?
- 20 A. No.
 - Q. You did not file a lawsuit against the
- 22 fire tender who heated the rocks?
- 23 A. No
 - Q. And you did not file a lawsuit against
- 5 the Hamiltons, the owner of Angel Valley?

2

5

6

12

15

25

1

9

A. No.

1

2

5

18

24

2

3

5

6

8

Q. You did not file a lawsuit against the

3 paramedics or any of the first responders?

A. No.

Q. And what state was this lawsuit filed in?

A. California.

7 Q. Are you familiar, Ms. Gennari, with the

legal requirements necessary in California to file

9 this initial complaint setting forth your lawsuit?

10 A. No.

11 Q. Can I direct your attention to paragraph

12 10 of the lawsuit. And therein it's stated that

13 defendant, meaning Mr. Ray, and James Ray

14 International, refused to disclose the event

15 schedule or planned activities until plaintiff,

16 that's you, and the other participants arrived in

17 Sedona, Arizona, for the seminar.

What do you know about that?

19 A. It's partially true.

Q. What part of it is true?

21 A. We were not given a schedule. But some

22 of the activities could be gleaned from the release

23 document.

Q. In your experience as a participant at

25 other James Ray events, is there a surprise element

214

1 to the events?

A. Yes.

Q. Has that been your experience at all the

4 different seminars?

A. Pretty much. Yeah.

Q. Did Mr. Ray ever tell you why there was

7 this surprise element?

A. No. But I do remember him thanking

9 everybody once for not telling people what the

10 surprise was at some events because that was part

11 of the deal.

Q. If I can direct your attention to

13 paragraph 11 where it states, upon arrival in

14 Sedona on October 3rd, 2009, all participants were

15 required to sign various documents for the program.

16 No refunds were allowed.

17 A. Yes.

Q. Are you familiar with Mr. Ray's refund

19 policy?

18

20 MR. LI: Objection. Relevance. Subject of a

21 pretrial motion.

22 THE COURT: Sustained.

23 Q. BY MS. POLK: Has Mr. Ray's refund policy

24 affected your attendance at seminars?

25 MR. LI: Same objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. LI: And relevance of what this particular

3 witness's motivations are.

4 THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

Q. BY MS. POLK: And how so?

7 A. There were events I went to simply

8 because I had paid for them. And when I discovered

I was -- if I didn't feel like it or wasn't really

10 into what he was doing, I would stay because I had

11 paid for it.

Q. What was the refund policy?

13 MR. LI: Objection.

14 THE WITNESS: No refund.

THE COURT: Sustained.

16 Q. BY MS. POLK: Mr. Li asked you a line of

17 questions about, well, why didn't you just leave.

18 Why didn't you just leave Spiritual Warrior 2009?

19 A. Given not only my mental state but the

20 fact that I had paid an enormous pile of money to

21 be there, I -- you know -- I can't imagine I ever22 would have just got up and left.

23 Q. Well, why not just get your money back

24 and leave?

MR. LI: Objection. Argumentative.

216

THE COURT: Sustained. Form of the question.

2 Q. BY MS. POLK: Let me direct your

3 attention to paragraph 15 where it states,

4 defendant, meaning Mr. Ray, and James Ray

5 International, used group hypnosis on plaintiff and

6 the other participants to prevent them from

7 thinking rationally or taking steps for their own

8 safety.

Will you explain.

10 A. These would be things like guided11 meditation, which would be, basically, guided

12 hypnosis. Getting the group riled up around13 some -- like in the sweat lodge when everybody

14 started chanting, you're more than that, you're

15 more than that, to anybody who complained or said

16 they wanted to leave.

And it just created this atmosphere of pressure and the setup of very little sleep and controlling when our breaks were and controlling our food. It all was -- it all put me off balance.

21 I didn't have access to my normal processing.22 Q. Now, you just testified that the guided

23 meditation was, essentially, guided hypnosis?

A. Yes.

Q. How so? What do you mean?

24

1

11

15

1 MR. LI: Objection. I think this is calling 2 for an opinion.

3 THE COURT: Sustained.

4 MR. LI: And, Your Honor, we move to admit the 5 entire complaint under Rule 106 to complete this 6 entire line of questioning.

7 THE COURT: Ms. Polk.

8 MS. POLK: Your Honor, the state does not 9 believe this exhibit should be admitted. But it is 10 Mr. Li who opened this line of questioning in his 11 cross-examination.

12 THE COURT: It won't be admitted at this time.

Q. BY MS. POLK: Ms. Gennari, if I can

14 direct your attention to paragraph 19. And this is

15 a paragraph that Mr. Li read to you where it

16 states, when plaintiff attempted to escape from the

17 sweat lodge, the defendant, James Arthur Ray,

18 blocked her passage with threats of offensive

19 touching.

20 And you testified you do not believe that

21 is true?

22 A. Yes.

Q. Did Mr. Ray ever, to your knowledge,

24 touch you as you were attempting to leave the sweat

25 lodge?

5

8

15

16

218

1 A. No.

Q. Do you know if that term "offensive touching" is a legal term under California law?

4 A. I don't know.

Q. Do you know what that term means --

6 "offensive touching"?

7 A. Not legally.

Q. What did Mr. Ray do that prevented you

9 from leaving his sweat lodge?

10 A. In a big, authoritative voice, he said,

11 no. You're too late. We're starting again. Find

12 yourself a spot.

13 Q. Did you believe you had a choice at that

14 time to get out of his sweat lodge?

A. No.

Q. And why not?

17 A. His giant voice said no. In the state I

18 was in, adding the scary voice, I did what the

19 scary voice said.

Q. Were you conscious of the flap, then,being closed?

22 A. At some point.

Q. And once that flap was closed, to your

24 knowledge, was there a way for you to get out?

25 A. No.

55 of 69 sheets

Q. And if I can direct your attention to

2 paragraph 20. And I'm going to read the last three

3 lines -- or actually, it's the last sentence of

4 paragraph 20. It's written, by way of group

5 hypnosis, sleep deprivation, and inadequate

6 nutrition, the defendant incapacitated plaintiff,

7 that would be you, so that in the extreme

8 circumstances of the overheated sweat lodge,

9 plaintiff was deprived of rational thought and was

10 unable to help herself.

Would you please explain.

MR. LI: Your Honor, under Rule 106, I would ask that the prosecutor read the first sentence of paragraph 20 as well.

THE COURT: I need to see the counsel, please.

(Sidebar conference.)

17 THE COURT: I understand that this was brought

18 up on cross-examination. But this scrutiny into

19 the complaint. There are elements of a prior

20 inconsistent statement involved before, and now

21 it's just going through the complaint.

22 And, Ms. Polk, I'm doing that to frame

23 your explanation for why there is relevance to

24 this.

25

1

12

Go ahead, please.

MS. POLK: Because Mr. Li has suggested that

2 this witness is not telling the truth as she

3 testifies today. He has set this complaint out

4 there as a motive for her to lie, suggested that

5 there is economic benefit to her if he is convicted

6 in this case and has created this suggestion using

7 this lawsuit that this witness is lying.

8 MR. LI: I'd ask the state to lower her voice.

9 THE COURT: You will get a chance.

10 MR. LI: That the state lower the voice a

11 little bit. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Yes. Thank you.

MS. POLK: He went through. He picked and chose paragraphs here and there where there were

15 inconsistent statements. He didn't touch all the

16 other paragraphs where it's very consistent with

17 her testimony.

18 I'm entitled to two things. One is to

rehabilitate with everything that is consistent.No. 2, to explore the topic of the lawsuit and why

21 she filed it, which I didn't address on direct

22 because I had no notice from Mr. Li that he was

23 going to do it because there was a discovery

24 violation.

He went there. He spent a lot of time on

Page 217 to 220 of 275

the lawsuit. And I'm now entired talk to her 1 2 about what's in the lawsuit and what her reasons 3 were for filing it for two purposes. One is to 4 rehabilitate, and the second is it's fair redirect on a topic that was raised in cross-examination.

MR. LI: First of all, there is no discovery violation.

6

7

8

9

10

11

1

3

5

6

7

8

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Second of all, the state can simply just -- we'll stipulate to admitting the entire complaint if that's what the state want's to do. Let's talk about the complaint. The jury can see every paragraph that this witness alleged. 12

13 Thirdly, what I did was entirely proper. 14 I asked her whether she had ever said "X," and she said no. I put the complaint in front of her, and 15 16 then she acknowledged that the statements in the complaint -- which were drafted on her behalf. 17 There is no getting around that. Drafted on her 18 behalf. 19

20 Before the break she said that she had 21 read it. And she changed her testimony. Before 22 the break she said she had read it, and then she 23 had to admit on cross-examination that what was 24 written in her complaint is untrue. That's classic 25 impeachment.

222

What the state is currently doing is just sort of walking through the complaint and saying 2 isn't this true and don't you believe in these allegations and what have you. Extrinsic evidence is not admissible to show a prior consistent statement.

THE COURT: Go ahead, Ms. Polk.

MS. POLK: Judge, first of all, before the break she never said she had read it. I believe

10 before the break she said she had not read it all.

11 THE COURT: She said she read as much as she 12 could stand.

13 MS. POLK: Exactly. She never said she read 14 it all before the break.

Secondly, these are doors that were opened by Mr. Li, and the state is entitled to rehabilitate the witness.

The defense suggested that her testimony was not credible because she had an economic incentive, and then they picked a couple of paragraphs here and there written by her attorney, which she admitted on the stand are not true.

23 I'm entitled to rehabilitate her with that lawsuit, and I'm entitled to discuss why she 24 filed the lawsuit, what is it about this event that

made her file me lawsuit. 1

He has suggested she has an economic 2 incentive to lie. The state has the right to have 3 her explain why she filed the lawsuit. And the 4 explanation is all of these things during the week 5 that caused her great emotional and physical distress are the reasons why she filed. 7

And I have a right to go through to show 8 that there is plenty in that lawsuit that is true, 9 is consistent with her testimony, and to explain 10 why she filed the lawsuit. 11

MR. LI: There is no evidence code section 12 called "opening the door." There has to be some 13 specific evidentiary code that relates to the 14 admissibility of particular types of questions. It 15 is -- extrinsic facts are not admissible to prove a 16 prior consistent statement. 17

I would submit if the state wants to get 18 into the lawsuit, just admit it. Whatever the 19 20 state --

21 THE COURT: The fact that inconsistent statements are brought out does not mean consistent statements come in from anywhere. But the other 23 aspect is the suggestion that this -- there is 24 25

motive and bias and that this lawsuit colors all

224

the testimony.

And so there is some reason to show 2 that -- grounds to show that this person has a 3 belief in the legitimacy of the lawsuit and the 4 accuracy of the allegations. 5

6 But at this point there has been so many paragraphs brought up, it's almost to a point where 7 you get into a recross situation. And your 9 suggesting and would stipulate it should be just admitted? And why shouldn't it be at this point? 10 Because it's so disjointed. 11

MS. POLK: Because these are -- this is the 12 beginning of a lawsuit. I don't know what else is 13 in the lawsuit. I don't know if there was an 14 answer filed by the defendant that admitted some of 15 this, that denied some of this. I don't even know 16 the stage because there was no disclosure to the 17 state. We didn't even know there was a lawsuit 18 19 filed.

20 I want to point out this investigation 21 was done and the indictment filed in February 2010. This lawsuit is filed months later in September 22 of 2010 after these witnesses have been interviewed 23 and no disclosure to the state by the defense. We 24

could have litigated all these issues in an

56 of 69 sheets

1

15

25

8

16

19

25

appropriate forum if they had complied with the 1 2 rules. So here we are at sidebars and at breaks trying to litigate this issue.

I won't spend a whole lot more time on the lawsuit. I don't believe it should come in. I don't think the jury is the appropriate body to be 7 looking at a legal filing and understand what it's about. 8

9 THE COURT: Well, it's coming in piecemeal, a 10 bit at a time at this point.

MS. POLK: On the legal theories.

12 THE COURT: I need to ask you something you 13 said twice. You apparently knew that some people had filed lawsuits but not this person? Is that 14 what you're saying? Because I thought you knew 15 this person had filed a lawsuit. 16

17 MS. POLK: We did not, Your Honor. We knew from the media that the victims had filed lawsuits. 18

We learned from the defense attorneys when they did 19

20 interviews of witnesses because they questioned

21 them about lawsuits. Then we learned about

22 lawsuits.

11

23 But these -- none of these witnesses had filed lawsuits before we filed our indictment. So 24

these are, like this one, filed long after these 25

226

witnesses were interviewed by the detectives. We 2 iust didn't know.

MR. LI: Your Honor, for the record, the state 3 is well aware that there have been lawsuits. 4

They've been communicating with plaintiffs' lawyers 5

among other things. 6

Detective Diskin himself at some 7 8 interview of some witness talked with Ms. Do about a mediation that had taken place between various of 9 the parties. The state is well aware of that. 10

THE COURT: Talking about this particular 11 witness, Mr. Li? 12

13 MR. LI: I can't speak to what the state's knowledge is, Your Honor. 14

15 MS. POLK: I can. We didn't know she had 16 filed.

17 MR. LI: They could just ask.

THE COURT: First of all, you have gone into 18

the lawsuit considerably, Ms. Polk, and the idea 19

that this person believes it's a legitimate 20

21 lawsuit. The defense has pointed out inconsistent

statements. For this particular ruling, yes, the 22

23 whole paragraph can be read in context. It's all

in one paragraph, one allegation. And you can go 24

into that.

57 of 69 sheets

Ther than -- I don't know if you

need to really get into it any further. General 2

questions about the belief in the lawsuit or

4 something, I think that's fine. But this

dissecting this legal document any further is not

appropriate. That level of scrutiny, the defense 6

7 did present this really in the context of an

inconsistent statement. 8

I agree they went beyond that and said, 9 overall motive and bias maybe suggesting it's 10 11 frivolous or something. You can go into some general questions about that. With regard to this 12 paragraph, though, I'm going to order that the 13 entire paragraph be read. 14

(End of sidebar conference.)

THE COURT: Ms. Polk, when you're ready.

16 Q. BY MS. POLK: Ms. Gennari, if you'd look 17 at paragraph 20. Let me read to you the first 18 sentence. While in the sweat lodge of October 8th, 19 2009, plaintiff attempted to escape the lodge but 20

was prevented from doing so by defendant, James 21 Arthur Ray, who physically touched her in an 22

offensive way thereby causing her to suffer severe 23

personal injuries and extreme emotional distress. 24

Let me ask you, first of all, did Mr. Ray

physically touch you as you attempted to escape his

2 sweat lodge?

3 A. No. Q. And the statement is he physically

touched you in an offensive way. Do you know

whether or not that is a legal term under

7 California law?

A. I don't know.

Q. And then the second sentence is the one I 9

had just read. By way of group hypnosis, sleep 10

deprivation, and inadequate nutrition, the 11

defendants incapacitated plaintiff so that in the 12

13 extreme circumstances of the overheated sweat

lodge, plaintiff was deprived of rational thought 14

and was unable to help herself. 15

> Α. Yes.

Q. Is there anything about that statement 17 that is false? 18

A. No.

20 Q. And then if you'll look at paragraph 28, it states, defendants in each of them --21

MR. LI: Your Honor, I renew our request to 22 just admit the entire exhibit. 23

THE COURT: If there is further questioning in 24

that regard, I am going to force a stipulation, Page 225 to 228 of 275

16

22

25

2

5

```
essentially, if there is going to be more
1
2
   questioning through the complaint.
        MS. POLK: Your Honor, I would like to
3
4
   question her further about it.
5
```

THE COURT: Then there will be -- I'm going to force a stipulation and admit the exhibit, then.

MR. LI: Thank you, Your Honor.

8 MS. POLK: That's fine, Your Honor. Thank 9 you.

THE COURT: Then I need the number on the 10 exhibit. My copy doesn't. Can I have the number, 11 12 please?

13 MR. LI: And we'd like recross, Your Honor.

14 MS. POLK: Your Honor, the state would object 15 to that.

16 THE COURT: I'm not granting that at this 17 point.

But, Ms. Polk, the number, please.

MS. POLK: It's Exhibit 784. 19

20 THE COURT: Exhibit 784 is admitted.

(Exhibit 784 admitted.)

Q. BY MS. POLK: And if you will look at 22 23 paragraph 28. Actually, I can put it up on the 24 overhead.

Do you see Exhibit 28? I'm sorry.

maximize her health and energy and to amplify her 5 physical strength. 6 Were those promises made to you by 7 Mr. Ray? 8 A. Yeah. That was from the marketing 9 materials. 10

plaintiff's creative intelligence, intuition, and

relationships and to ramp up her ability to attract

mental functioning to deepen her personal

people, to achieve financial freedom, and to

Q. What marketing materials are you 11

referring to? 12 13 MR. LI: Objection. Relevance, subject to the 14 pretrial ruling.

THE COURT: Sustained. 15

paragraph 36 where it states, defendants 17 intentionally inflicted severe emotional distress 18 upon plaintiff and others in order to make them 19 feel ever more in need of defendant's solutions for 20 21 a successful life.

Q. BY MS. POLK: Will you look at

Did that occur at Spiritual Warrior 2009?

A. Yes. 23

Q. And will you explain how. 24

MR. LI: Objection. Relevance. This is a

230

Paragraph 28? 1

6

7

18

21

25

2

11

12

13

18

A. Yes.

3 **Q.** Where it states, defendants in each of them negligently and carelessly subjected plaintiff and others without proper monitoring or safeguards 5 to dangerous levels of heat in the sweat lodge without adequate nutrition or liquids, thereby 7 directly and proximately causing plaintiff to 8 suffer severe physical and psychological injuries. 9 10 Miss Gennari, what are the severe

physical injuries that you suffered? A. I had breathing problems, some heat exposure, damage to my lungs. And my kidney function was affected.

14 MR. LI: Your Honor, move to strike. Hearsay. 15 16 This is all self-diagnosis.

17 THE COURT: Sustained.

Granted as to motion to strike.

Q. BY MS. POLK: Did you suffer 19

psychological injuries? 20

A. Yes.

21 22 Q. Now, I want to direct your attention to 23 paragraph 34. I'm not going to read the whole 24 thing, but I want to look at the bottom where it's written, defendant's promised to heighten

plaintiff's civil complaint for money. 1

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q. BY MS. POLK: Why did you file a lawsuit 3 4 against Mr. Ray?

A. I have a lot of medical bills piled up.

And I felt like to some extent it was my duty to 6 make as big a noise as possible so that this never 7 8 happens to anybody again.

Q. And why do you feel that way? 9

MR. LI: Objection, Relevance. 10

THE COURT: Sustained. 11

Q. BY MS. POLK: I want to show you -- have 12 you look at Exhibit 784, paragraph 42. Defendant 13

is imposing intentional infliction of -- defendants 14

15 in imposing intentional infliction of emotional

distress upon, plaintiff, acted with malice, 16

oppression, and fraud; and, plaintiff submits, that 17

by way of punishment and example and to prevent 18

future conduct by defendants. 19

Is that what you are referring to? 20

Α.

Q. That was one of your reasons for filing 22

the lawsuit? 23

A. Yes.

MR. LI: Objection. Leading. 25

232

21

- 1 THE COURT: Sustained.
- **Q.** BY MS. POLK: I want to ask you just a
- 3 couple of questions about inside Mr. Ray's sweat
- 4 lodge ceremony. You testified in response to a
- question from Mr. Li that the Dream Team members
- 6 were told to sit at the four cardinal directions?
- 7 A. Yes.

Я

24

2

- Q. Who told them to sit there?
- 9 A. Mr. Rav.
- 10 Q. And you testified that you think the pit
- 11 was off center?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. What do you recall about that?
- 14 A. I think it was a little closer to the
- 15 back than the center.
- **Q.** And then you were asked several questions
- 17 about your choice -- your choice to leave the
- 18 events of the week, your choice to leave the sweat
- 19 lodge when you wanted?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. You answered that you could leave only if
- 22 I were to override all the reasons you were there.
- 23 Would you explain that statement to the jury.
 - A. Well, I was there to get to another
- 25 level, to break through some barriers. And to that
 - end, I was committed to doing everything placed in
 - front of me. You know, I -- I made a commitment of
- 3 money and time and effort, and I wanted everything
- 4 I could get out of that.
- **Q.** And how is your physical condition today?
- 6 MR. LI: Objection. Asked and answered.
- 7 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 8 THE WITNESS: Well, I'm certainly not back to
- 9 where I was before. I no longer need medication
- 10 for my lungs. I'm not as -- I still get winded
- 11 easily. And in chorus I breathe more than I ever
- 12 used to because I -- it's like when I do take a
- 13 breath, it's not as useful as it should be.
- 14 Q. BY MS. POLK: And psychologically or
- 15 emotionally how are you today?
- 16 MR. LI: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance.
- 17 THE COURT: Overruled.
- **18** THE WITNESS: Pretty delicate and messy.
- 19 MS. POLK: Thank you, Ms. Gennari.
- 20 Thank you, Your Honor.
 - THE COURT: Members of the jury, do any of you
- 22 have any questions for this witness?
- 23 JURY FOREMAN: We do have a question.
- 24 THE COURT: Ms. Gennari, I'll ask that you
- 25 remain, please, while I go over the jury questions.

- 1 Coursel, if I could please see you up
- 2 here.
- 3 (Sidebar conference.)
- 4 MR. LI: Your Honor, I would make a motion
- 5 under 15.1(g) for her medical records and bills
- 6 before the witness is excused. That's all.
- 7 THE COURT: Then she won't be excused
- 8 technically. If that's --
- 9 MR. LI: We need -- we would like her medical
- 10 records and bills under 15.1(g).
- 11 THE COURT: Ms. Polk?
- MS. POLK: Your Honor the state does not have
- 13 any of that. I believe that the defendant has it.
- 14 He is a party to that lawsuit. The state knows
- 15 very little about -- but I have no objection to not
- 16 excusing this witness if the Court wants to hear
- 17 argument on this motion at a later date.
- 18 THE COURT: That's the only way I can preserve
- 19 it.
- 20 MR. LI: I just want to preserve it.
- 21 THE COURT: Here's the question, though, for
- 22 the attorneys.
- 23 MR. LI: No objection.
- 24 THE COURT: Mr. Li?
- 25 MS. POLK: The state has no objection.

1

2

8

14

18

20

- THE COURT: Thank you.
- Attorneys have no objection.
- **3** (End of sidebar conference.)
- 4 THE COURT: Ms. Gennari, I will ask the
- 5 questions. The attorneys may choose to follow up.
- 6 And there are two questions here. And I'll ask
- 7 them separately.
 - Did you testify on Friday that you and
- 9 others went shopping in Sedona on Friday following
- 10 the sweat lodge ceremony?
- 11 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 12 THE COURT: Follow up, Ms. Polk?
- 13 MS. POLK: Yes, Your Honor.
 - FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 15 BY MS. POLK:
- 16 Q. What was your mental condition at that
- **17** time?
 - A. Dazed.
- 19 Q. And what do you mean?
 - A. I barely saw anything when we went to --
- 21 I barely saw anything that I saw, so to speak. I
- 22 kind of mindlessly and very numb and very in shock
- 23 walked in and out of almost every store just kind
- 24 of looking at the shiny objects and dazed.
 - Q. Whose idea was it to go shopping?

25

```
A. My friend Laura wanted to go into town.
She wanted to get away from Angel Valley.
```

3 Q. And what was your physical condition at 4 that time?

A. Slow and weak and tired, but still kind of running on shock.

7 Q. Thank you.

Thank you, Judge.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 Mr. Li?

11 MR. LI: Yes, Your Honor.

12 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

13 BY MR. LI:

1

2

5

6

8

14 Q. While you were slow, tired, and running

15 on shock, you went shopping in Sedona?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Did you go to art galleries?

18 A. I don't think so.

19 Q. Did you go to curio shops?

20 A. Yeah.

Q. Crystals, all of those sorts of things?

22 A. I don't remember. The touristy things.

23 Q. Touristy things. After the incident in

24 which two people passed away, you went shopping;

25 correct?

1

2

9

20

21

about the case another witness, avoiding anymedia exposure as well.

So with all that in mind, you are excusedtemporarily at this time.

And I'm going to ask Ms. Rybar, beforeyou bring the next witness in, I do want to address

7 the parties and the jury a moment.

8 So you are excused at this time, ma'am.

9 Thank you.

So before the next witness is called,
ladies and gentlemen, I just wanted to address a
couple of questions or concerns that had come to me
from the jury.

14 First, there was mention of a witness
15 list and providing a witness list. And I do recall
16 that. Back during jury selection I indicated that
17 a witness list would be provided. My purpose in
18 that was to give you something to see because there

19 is a considerable number of witnesses. And I

20 wanted to make sure that if anybody knew one of

21 those witnesses or thought you knew a witness, you

22 could actually be reading a name and not just

23 listening to me read all the names. That was my

24 reason for doing that.

However, with the discussions I've had

238

25

A. Yes. To get away from Angel Valley.

Q. Thank you.

3 Nothing further.

4 THE COURT: How long were you shopping in

5 town, Sedona, on that Friday?

THE WITNESS: We had lunch and wandered around for maybe a couple of hours.

8 THE COURT: Ms. Polk, follow-up questions?

MS. POLK: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

10 THE COURT: Mr. Li?

11 MR. LI: No, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Thank you.

13 And, Ms. Gennari, you will be excused

14 from the trial at this time, but you are not going

15 to be completely excused. You are subject to

16 recall. So that's possible.

17 The rule of exclusion of witnesses

18 remains in effect. And do you recall the

19 discussion I had with you about that --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: And the importance of not

22 discussing the case or your testimony with any

23 other witness until the trial is completely over

24 and not communicating with other people who might

25 relay testimony or something you might say or think

1 among parties, it turns out that really the

2 witnesses are, for the most part, not local. It's

3 very unlikely that any of you would know them. So

4 it was just decided not to give you a witness list.

5 So that's why you didn't get the witness list.

6 It's not anticipated that the people on

7 the list -- or all the people will be called. I'll

8 tell you that. But I'm not going to be providing

9 the witness list. And I hope that provides the

10 explanation for why I indicated that I would in the

11 first place.

12 The other matter is not really a

13 question, but it has to do with the admonition.

14 And, once again, I thank you for following the

15 admonition so closely. And we have this system

16 where you provide notes if there is a possible

17 incident.

18 And that is what this was. It was a

19 possible incident. It was handled exactly

20 correctly. The attorneys have seen the note. And,

21 again, thank you. That's exactly what we're

22 asking. But that's not an issue of concern in

23 light of your explanation.

So with that, Ms. Polk, if you would call

25 the next witness.

240

- 1 MS. POLK: The state calls melinda Martin, 2 please. 3 THE COURT: Ma'am, if you would please step to
- the front of the courtroom where the bailiff is
- directing you and raise your right hand to be sworn
- by the clerk.
- 7 MELINDA MARTIN,
- having been first duly sworn upon her oath to tell
- 9 the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
- truth, testified as follows: 10
- 11 THE COURT: Please be seated here at the
- 12 witness stand.
- 13 Would you please begin by stating and
- 14 spelling your full name.
- 15 THE WITNESS: Melinda Martin, M-e-l-i-n-d-a,
- 16 Martin, M-a-r-t-i-n.
- 17 THE COURT: Thank you.
- 18 Ms. Polk.
- 19 MS. POLK: Thank you.
- 20 **DIRECT EXAMINATION**
- 21 BY MS. POLK:
- 22 Q. Good afternoon, Miss Martin.
- 23 Good afternoon.
- 24 Q. I'm Sheila Polk. You and I have spoken
- on the phone?

242

- 1 Α. Uh-huh.
- 2 **Q.** Thank you for being here. Will you start
- by telling the jury what community you live in?
- 4 Α. Now?
- Q. Yes. 5
- Α. **New York City.** 6
- 7 Q. What do you do in New York City?
- A. I'm in real estate. 8
- Q. How long have you been in real estate 9
- 10 there?
- 11 Α. Probably about four months now just in
- 12 **New York City.**
- 13 **Q.** Prior to moving to New York, what
- 14 community were you living in?
- A. I was living in Carlsbad, California. 15
- 16 Q. How long did you live in Carlsbad,
- 17 California, for?
 - A. For a little less than a year.
- 19 Q. Prior to Carlsbad, California, where did
- 20 you live?

18

21

- A. I lived in Mexico for a short time.
- 22 Q. Did there come a time that you were hired
- 23 by Mr. Ray to work for his company?
- 24 Α. Yes.
- 25 How was it that you learned that Mr. Ray

- 1 needed an ensoloyee?
- They had placed an advertisement that I 2
- answered. 3
- Q. 4 What was the name of his company?
 - James Ray International. Α.
- 6 Do you recall what he was advertising
- 7 for?

5

8

21

5

8

- Α. An event coordinator.
- Q. You had an interview? 9
- Α. Yes. 10
- Q. Who did you interview with? 11
- 12 Α. Megan Fredrickson.
- 13 Q. Did you get hired at that time?
- 14 Α. Yes. I interviewed a couple of times.
- You came back for another interview? 15
- 16 Α. Yes.
- 17 Q. Who with?
- Α. Megan Fredrickson. 18
- Approximately when was it that you got 19
- 20 hired to work for James Ray International?
 - A. I believe it was February of 2009.
- How long did you work for James Ray 22 Q.
- 23 International?
- 24 A. I worked from then until the event --
- this event, until October of 2009. 25
- 1 Q. October of 2009?
- 2 Α. Yes.
- Q. Where was your office when you worked for 3
- 4 James Ray International?
 - A. It was in Carlsbad, California.
- Did you move to Carlsbad specifically to 6
- 7 work for Mr. Ray?
 - A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Will you explain to the jury what the job
- 10 entailed as an event coordinator.
- A. I organized all of the events. I 11
- contacted the hotels. I hire people locally to 12
- help with -- you know -- various aspects of the 13
- event. I coordinated everything that went along 14
- with the syntax, organized the room itself -- you
- know -- the lighting -- you know -- that kind of
- thing. I kind of organized every logistical aspect 17
- of the event. 18
- Q. What prior experience had you had that 19 qualified you, if you know, for this job? 20
- A. I had been doing events for many years.
- 22 Usually I had done it for free. I did a lot of big
- charitable events in San Diego for many, many 23
- 24 vears.
 - As event coordinator who did you answer

21

- 1 to at James Ray International?
- 2 A. Megan Fredrickson.
- 3 Q. And do you know who Megan Fredrickson
- 4 answered to?
 - Α. James Ray.
- 6 Q. Did you meet James Ray?
- 7 A. Yes.

15

18

- Q. And in your employment as event
- 9 coordinator, did you work directly with James Ray?
- 10 Α. Yes. On occasions I did. Yes.
- Q. 11 How many events had you served as event
- 12 coordinator from the time you were hired in
- 13 February -- did you say February of 2009 or 2008?
- 14 Α. 2009, I believe.
 - Q. Okay. How many events did you coordinate
- between February of 2009 and Spiritual Warrior 16
- 17 of 2009?
 - I'd have to count them. And I would have Α.
- 19 to take the time to do that. I did all of his
- 20 events up until that time except for the two-hour
- 21 events that did he, which were very consistent.
- But I'd say probably one a month for that period of
- 23 time.

24

5

18

22

25

- Q. Was Mr. Ray holding an event once a
- 25 month?

- 246
- 1 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, I'm going to object to
- 2 the form of the guestion. The entity is JRI, not
- 3 my dient.
- 4 THE COURT: Sustained.
 - Q. BY MS. POLK: Were there events once a
- 6 month that you were coordinating?
- 7 I wouldn't say exactly once a month
- 8 necessarily. But it was pretty close to once a
- 9 month.
- 10 Q. Could you give us, then, a rough estimate
- 11 of how many events you had coordinated prior to
- 12 Spiritual Warrior 2009 in October.
- 13 I coordinated all of his events except
- 14 for two of them. So I would say -- I'd have to
- 15 look at it to tell you exactly how many I did.
- 16 Q. Was this a full-time job?
- 17 Α.
 - Q. And how many employees worked at
- 19 James Ray International when you worked there?
- 20 A. Between -- I think around 20 people,
- 21 thereabouts.
 - Q. Did anybody answer to you?
- 23 A. When we did events, the Dream Team people 24 would, and the people that we hired locally did.
- - Can you tell me the other categories of Q.

- employment at sames Ray International other than 1
- 2 event coordinator?
 - A. We had the receptionist. We had somebody
- who handled marketing. We had somebody who handled 4 5
 - bill collection. We had people who did -- they'd
- crunch the numbers on the events to see where we 6
- 7 were going.

3

8

19

21

24

25

- And then a lot of the people were more working with the people themselves. Like, they
- 9 10 would go to events and they would work directly
- 11 with the people on their breakthroughs.
- 12 And those were employees of the company
- who would work with people on breakthroughs? 13
- 14 something in the office. And then when they would 15

Yes. They had two jobs. They would have

- go to the event, they would have sort of a 16
- different hat that they would wear. 17
- 18 After you got hired to work at James Ray
 - International, did you receive any training?
- 20 A little bit. Before each event I would
 - be briefed on what was going to happen and what I
- 22 was going to be doing. That was the training I
- 23 received.
 - Q. Who did that briefing?
 - A. Megan.

- 248
- 1 Q. And specifically what did you need to do
- 2 to coordinate an event?
- 3 From contacting the hotels, I would work Δ.
- with the hotel staff on the room set up, how we 4
- would have things. James's room. I will usually 5
- work with them on that. I would work with them 6
- on -- you know -- I would put together and work 7
- 8 with the marketing department on putting together
- 9 things that we would give out to participants. I
- 10 would print out things for participants. I would
- organize how the layout -- how everything was going 11
- 12 to flow throughout the event, things like that.
- 13 Had you attended any events put on by 14
 - Mr. Ray before you were hired as event coordinator?
- A. 15 No.

16

18

Page 245 to 248 of 275

- Q. Were you familiar with James Ray?
- Yes. A little bit. 17 Α.
 - How were you familiar with him? Q.
- I had used one of his CD collections 19 A.
- previously. It was more business-minded. It had 20
- to do with -- it was called "Twenty-one Days to 21
- Success," -- certain coaching. I might have the 22
- name flipped around. But it was about business. 23
- It was about building a business. And I had 24
- listened to those. 25

3

5

7

8

19

1

2

250

Q. Were you familiar with the teachings, then, that occurred at the various events that you coordinated before you coordinated them?

MR. KELLY: Objection. Lack of foundation, Judge.

THE COURT: That called for a yes or no response to start with.

So if you can answer that, you may.

THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the question.

10 Q. BY MS. POLK: You told the jury that you

11 coordinated events -- several events between

12 February and October of 2009. But you had not

13 attended any of those events prior to being hired?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. Were you familiar with the teachings by

16 Mr. Ray at the various events?

17 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, same objection.

THE COURT: It calls for a yes or no. And

19 then if there is further foundation that can be

20 provided, then things can go from there.

21 But if you can answer that, Miss Martin,

22 go ahead if you can answer yes or no. If you can't

23 answer yes or no, you can tell the attorney that

24 also.

25

2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

18

THE WITNESS: Right. I can't answer yes or

1 no, but I can explain.

As I learned it -- I learned it as I was

3 going through it, basically.

4 Q. BY MS. POLK: Let's talk about Spiritual

5 Warrior 2009 that occurred in October of 2009.

6 Were you the event coordinator for that seminar?

7 A. In that particular event -- and that was 8 the only event that I was not the event coordinator

9 on.

10 Q. And why weren't you?

11 A. Because Megan Fredrickson said she was

12 going to be the event coordinator at that time.

13 Q. Did you attend as a staff employee of --

14 A. I did.

15 Q. You attended Spiritual Warrior 2009 as an

16 employee?

18

21

22

17 A. Yes.

Q. What was your role?

19 A. It was the liaison between JRI and Angel

20 Valley Resort and JRI and the participants.

Q. Were you familiar prior to October

of 2009 with the various events that constituted

23 Spiritual Warrior 2009?

24 A. I was briefed on it about a month and a

25 half, I'd say, beforehand by Megan.

1 Q. Specifically what did you learn from

2 Megan at that time?

MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection. Hearsay.

4 THE COURT: Could be. Sustained.

Q. BY MS. POLK: Were you briefed by Megan

6 that there would be a sweat lodge?

A. Yes.

Q. Will you tell the jury who the other

9 employees were who attended Spiritual Warrior 2009.

10 A. Megan and Josh Fredrickson. And Greg11 Hartle was an employee. But he attended as a

12 participant and not as an employee.

13 Q. How do you know that?

14 A. Because we knew that he was just

15 attending as a participant so he can experience

16 that event.

17 Q. Okay. What was Megan Fredrickson's

18 title -- her employment at James Ray International?

A. She was director of operations.

20 Q. And what was Josh Fredrickson's title?

21 A. He was director of marketing at the time.

22 Q. Are the two of them married?

23 A. Yes

24 Q. Any other employees of James Ray

25 International that attended Spiritual Warrior 2009?

A. Well, Marta Reis wasn't really an

employee, that I'm aware of. She was somebody that

3 was employed, like a vendor. And also Michael

4 Barber was also a vendor. But they were regular --

5 they were regularly hired by JRI.

6 Q. Contract vendors?

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. And what about someone named Taylor

9 Butler?

14

15

18

21

22

10 A. Oh. I forgot about her. She is James's

11 personal assistant. Yes. She was there.

12 Q. Was she at the time a full-time employee

13 of James Ray International?

A. Yes

Q. So there were four employees of James Ray

16 International, including you, who attended

17 Spiritual Warrior 2009?

A. Yes.

19 Q. Were you familiar with what a Dream Team

20 member was?

A. Yes.

Q. And how was it that you were familiar

23 with Dream Teams?

A. We had Dream Team members that volunteered at every one of our events.

Page 249 to 252 of 275

2

3

4

Q.

Α.

And aid Tanya go to Spiritual

What training did you receive?

Warrior 2009 in Sedona, Arizona?

She did not.

- 1 Do you know who the bream Team members 2 were at Spiritual Warrior 2009? Yes. 3 Α. Can you tell the jury their names? 5 I can try. Jennifer Haley, Liz Neuman, Barbara Waters, Christine Jobe, Mark Rock, Aaron --7 I don't recall his last name. Q. Would it be Bennett? 9 Α. Yes. 10 Who else? I can't think of the other 11 names. Q. 12 Was there a Lisa Rondan? 13 A. Lisa Rondan, yes. She was there. 14 Q. Do you know how many total Dream Team 15 members were there? 16 As many as I just mentioned plus Lisa. 17 Q. Would that be seven? Α. Yes. 18 19 Q. Did you know Liz Neuman before October 20 of 2009? 21 Α. I did not.
 - 22 Q. And do you know how these individuals 23 were selected to serve as Dream Team members for 24 this event? 25 Α. Every event people would write in to the company and -- they would volunteer. And the 1 members at JRI and Megan and a couple people in the 2 office would review their applications, for lack of 3 a better word. They would kind of review who the 4 people were and what sort of qualifications they 5 had. And they would make a choice as to who they 7 would like to have there at the event. Q. Were you ever involved in selecting the 8 Dream Team members for the events? 9 10 Α. Yes. 11 Q. And was Mr. Ray ever involved? 12 A. No. 13 Q. Did you ever get training in first aid and CPR? 14 15 Α. I did. 16 Q. When was that? 17 Α. A couple of months prior to Spiritual 18 Warrior.

Q. Who sent you to get training?

Did anybody else from James Ray

Yes. A gal named Tanya.

Just you and Tanya?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α.

Q.

Α.

Q.

Α.

Megan.

Yes.

International get training with you?

5 A. First aid and CPR. 6 Q. Specifically what sort of first aid 7 training? 8 How to treat burns, how to treat bug bites, how to treat abrasions, how to take care of 9 somebody -- you know -- if they were injured. And 10 11 then I learned CPR. 12 Q. Did Megan Fredrickson go to the training 13 with you? 14 Α. No, she did not. 15 Q. And how about Josh Fredrickson? Α. 16 No, he did not. Q. And Taylor Butler? 17 18 Α. No. 19 Q. Do you know whether those three 20 individuals had gone to training on another occasion? 21 22 A. I do not know. Do you know whether Megan Fredrickson had 23 ever been trained in CPR? 24 I do not know. 25 256 254 During Spiritual Warrior 2009, did you 1 ever see Megan Fredrickson performing CPR? 2 3 A. 4 Q. And same question for Josh Fredrickson. 5 Do you know if he was trained in CPR? A. 6 I do not know. 7 During Spiritual Warrior 2009, did you ever see Josh Fredrickson perform CPR? 8 Α. No. 9 10 Q. And same question for Taylor Butler. Same answer. I did not know if they 11 12 attended CPR training and did not see them. 13 What training was provided to the Dream Team members in order for them to volunteer 14 and assist at Spiritual Warrior 2009? 15 16 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection. Lack of 17 foundation. 18 THE COURT: Sustained. 19 BY MS. POLK: Do you know if any training was provided to the Dream Team members who dream 20 teamed the Spiritual Warrior 2009 event? 21 22 They received some instruction on the 23 various aspects of the event.

MR. KELLY: Your Honor, I'd resubmit my

objection as to foundation and ask that the answer

1

2

6

7

19

- 1 be stricken until there is additional soundation.
- 2 THE COURT: There wasn't foundation. So
- 3 sustained. And granted as to the motion.
- 4 BY MS. POLK: Let me ask you. Do you 5 know if they received training?
- 6 Α. Yes.
- 7 Q. And how do you know that they received
- 8 training?
- 9 A. It was part of our curriculum.
- 10 Did any of the Dream Team members receive Q.
- training at any place other than Angel Valley 11
- 12 Retreat in order to Dream Team this event?
- 13 Α. No.
- 14 Q. Where is it that they received training?
- 15 There at Angel Valley.
- 16 Q. Who provided the training?
- 17 Α. Megan Fredrickson.
- And describe for the jury what the 18 Q.
- 19 training was that they --
- 20 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, I'd still object as to
- 21 her personal knowledge.
- 22 THE COURT: Sustained as to foundation.
- 23 BY MS. POLK: Were you present when Megan
- 24 Fredrickson provided training to the Dream Team
- 25 members in October 2009 at the Angel Valley Retreat
 - 258

- 1 Center?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And describe for the jury what training
- 4 they received.
- 5 They were told about a particular aspect
- 6 of the event. They were told what their role would
- 7 be in facilitating that particular activity. She
- 8 would explain to them what their role was in that.
- 9 Do you know whether or not Megan
- 10 Fredrickson, Mr. Ray, or James Ray International
- ever assessed the technical skills of any of the 11
- 12 Dream Team members to dream team Spiritual
- 13 Warrior 2009?
- 14 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, may I object. It's a
- 15 compound question.
- 16 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 17 And, again, that question would call for
- 18 a yes or no response. If you can do that or if you 19 can't, let the attorney know that.
- 20 THE WITNESS: Would you like to repeat the
- 21 question, please.
- 22 BY MS. POLK: To your knowledge, were the
- technical skills of the Dream Team members ever
- 24 assessed or evaluated by Mr. Ray, Megan
- Fredrickson, or James Ray International?

- Α. certain extent, yes.
- And when did that happen?
- MR. KELLY: Your Honor, I'm going to object. 3
- Lack of foundation. It's a compound question which 4
- 5 is of the other three entities.
 - THE COURT: True. Sustained.
 - BY MS. POLK: Who assessed the technical
- skills, to your knowledge, of the Dream Team 8
- 9 members?
- 10 Α. The people at the office prior to the
- 11 event.
- 12 Q. Who were the people at the office?
- The people who have been to the different 13 Α.
- events. It would be Megan. It would be Michelle 14
- Goulet, Sheryl Stern, different people who have 15
- worked with various team members, Tina. They would 16
- say what their experience is in working with those 17
- different -- those people. 18
 - They would say, oh. She was easy to work
- 20 with or she wasn't easy to work with. Then they
- would make their selections based on previous 21
- experience working with them. 22
- Do you know what the basis was for 23
- selecting Dream Team members? You just said she 24
- was easy work with, she wasn't easy to work with. 25
- Do you know what the basis was for the decision to 1
- 2 select and bring on the Dream Team members?
- 3 That was the main criteria. Α.
- MR. KELLY: Your Honor, object to the 4
- response. It's nonresponsive, called for yes or 5
- 6 no.
- 7 THE COURT: Indeed it did.
- 8 So if you can answer that, Miss Martin,
- as a yes or no, please do so in that fashion. 9
- THE WITNESS: Okay. Then you will have to ask 10
- 11 me again, please.
- BY MS. POLK: Okay. Do you know what the 12
- basis for the criteria was to identify a Dream Team 13
- 14 member?

- Α. Yes.
- 16 Q. And what was it?
- 17 A. How easy they were to work with in the
- past. 18
- 19 Do you know if anybody from James Ray
- 20 International, Megan Fredrickson, or Mr. Ray ever
- 21 assessed the skills of these volunteers to serve as
- 22 a Dream Team member?
- 23 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, I'm going to object.
- Lack of foundation. My client was never involved 24
- in the assessment given her answer.

1 THE COURT: Well, the question covers a lot of ground. It can be answered yes or no, and then the specifics can be covered.
4 Once again, if that general question can be answered yes or no and it's got several components, then, Miss Martin, you may do that.

Q. BY MS. POLK: And the question is, do you know if their technical skills were ever assessed

9 or evaluated?

7

8

14

10 A. To a certain extent, yes.

11 Q. How do you know that?

12 A. That was the meeting that we held about 13 the Dream Team selection.

Q. And this is a meeting back at the

15 offices?

16 A. Correct.

Q. Do you know if anybody ever -- this is do
you know. Was it a criteria that a Dream Team
member, for example, know how to do CPR in order to

20 be brought on as a volunteer for Spiritual

21 Warrior 2009?

22 A. No.

Q. That was never a criteria?

24 A. No.

25 Q. Was it a criteria that the volunteer have

1 was ever provided during the days of the event

2 itself to the Dream Team members?

3 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection. Relevance.

4 THE COURT: Overruled.

5 THE WITNESS: They did not provide that

6 training.

Q. BY MS. POLK: Okay. Specifically wereyou present when Dream Team members were trained

9 during the event itself on site at Angel Valley?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Were you present for all of the training

12 sessions?

13 A. No.

14 Q. How many were you present for?

15 A. I'm not sure.

Q. When would the training sessions occur?

17 A. There was an overall briefing in the18 beginning, which I was there for. And then prior

19 to each activity, there would be a gathering

20 together of the Dream Team members and Megan, and

21 she would brief them once again as to their

22 responsibilities.

23 Q. In the process of -- when Megan

24 Fredrickson would brief the volunteer Dream Team

25 members about their responsibilities, was there

262

1 first-aid training?

2 A. No.

3

Q. Was it a criteria that the Dream Team --

4 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, I object. Leading. I

5 Object on the basis of relevance, ask that the last

6 three questions and answers be stricken.

7 THE COURT: I'm going to sustain the objection

8 to the current question. It's a leading question.

9 Sustained on that.

MR. KELLY: Your Honor, also in regards torelevance, Judge, these are questions directed

12 towards the responsibilities of JRI, not my client,

13 in this case.

16

18

25

14 THE COURT: You may -- I've made the ruling on

15 the one question. That was sustained.

And you may proceed, Ms. Polk.

17 MS. POLK: Thank you, Your Honor.

Q. Do you know -- this is a yes or no. Do

19 you know, Miss Martin, whether or not the

20 Dream Team members ever received first-aid training

21 prior to volunteering at Spiritual Warrior 2009?

22 A. No.

23 Q. You do not know?

24 A. I do not know.

Q. Do you know whether or not that training

1 actual training or just briefing about what the

2 expectations were?

A. Briefing on expectations.

4 MR. KELLY: Objection. Again, foundation.

THE COURT: Counsel, sustained as to the formof the question.

Q. BY MS. POLK: What did the briefing

8 entail?

3

9 A. An explanation of the activity and a
10 description of how they were going to be
11 participating in that activity or expediting the
12 activity.

Q. Miss Martin, I'm going to approach andhand you Exhibit 253 and ask if you recognize thatdocument?

A. Yes.

17 Q. What do you recognize that document to

18 be?

16

19

A. It's our syntax.

Q. Explain to the jury what that word

21 means -- "syntax."

22 A. It's a timeline of what happens when, for

23 how long, and what takes place. So it's sort of a

24 guideline of -- as to what activities we're going25 to be doing.

Page 261 to 264 of 275

3

8

13

18

24

25

6

9

- This document has some handwritten notes 1 Q. 2 on them. Do you know whose handwriting that is? 3 Α. Yes. Q. 4 Whose? 5 Α. Megan. 6 Q. Did you receive a copy of the syntax for
- 7 Spiritual Warrior 2009?
- 8 A. Yes.
- **Q.** Did it come with the handwritten notes on
- 10 it?
- 11 A. No.
- 12 Q. Do you know how this document was
- 13 created?
- 14 A. Yes. It was created in our office.
- 15 Q. Did you have a hand in creating it?
- 16 A. Yes. To a certain extent.
- 17 Q. And I just put it up on the overhead so I
- 18 can ask you generally -- I don't know if we can
- 19 read it. We have Spiritual Warrior. It says,
- 20 October 3rd to the 8th, 2009, Sedona, Arizona. And
- 21 then it says, pre-event Thursday, October 1st,
- 22 2009. Uniform, dress as you wish.
- 23 When did you arrive to Angel Valley in
- 24 Sedona, Arizona?
- 25 A. I believe I arrived on that day,
- 266

- 1 Thursday, October the 1st.
- 2 Q. Do you recall what day the event began
- 3 for the participants?
- 4 A. It was a day or two later. In looking at 5 the syntax, I'd be able to answer that.
- **Q.** Was a syntax something you were familiar
- 7 with before you gained employment with James Ray
- 8 International?
- 9 A. No. Before I gained employment?
- 10 **Q.** Yes.
- 11 A. No. That was something that we developed
- 12 within the company.
- 13 Q. And is that something that you had a hand
- 14 in developing, or did it exist before you took
- 15 employment there?
- 16 A. It existed. And then I had a hand in it
- 17 once I was there.
- 18 Q. Who was the syntax given to? Do you
- 19 know?
- 20 A. Yes. It was given to JRI team members as
- 21 well as Dream Team members.
- 22 Q. And specifically for the Spiritual
- 23 Warrior event?
- 24 A. Yes.
- **Q.** And were there activities on Thursday,

- 1 October 3rd; Praday, October 2; Saturday,
- 2 October 3rd, before the participants arrived?
 - A. Before the -- yes.
- 4 Q. At any time before participants arrived,
- 5 was there a discussion -- did you ever participate
- 6 in a discussion about safety measures to follow for
- 7 the Spiritual Warrior event?
 - A. No. Not safety.
- 9 Q. And at any time did you ever participate
- 10 in a discussion with Dream Team members about
- 11 safety measures to follow for the week in order to
- 12 keep participants safe?
 - A. I don't recall any safety measurements
- 14 being discussed.
- **Q.** Are you familiar with whether the events
- 16 of the week were audio recorded?
- 17 A. Most of our events were audio recorded.
 - Q. Who did the audio recordings?
- 19 A. Usually anybody working with the
- 20 audiovisual. So in this case I believe itwas Josh
- 21 or Michael Barber.
- 22 Q. And you told us earlier Michael Barber
- 23 was a vendor?
 - A. Yes
 - Q. For this specific event, Spiritual
 - Warrior 2009, were some of the events not
- 2 recorded -- some of the activities not recorded?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Do you know what activities were recorded
- 5 and which ones were not?
 - A. No.
- **7** Q. Do you know what determined what got
- 8 recorded and what did not get recorded?
 - A. No.
- 10 Q. Were certain locations recorded, for
- 11 example, the activities in the Crystal Hall?
- 12 A. Oh. I wasn't 100 percent aware if it was
- recorded. It was just general practice of thecompany to record the seminar portions of events.
- 15 Q. And what do you mean the by "the seminar
- 16 portions"?
- 17 A. The portions that would take place where
- 18 James would speak to everyone at length.
- Q. Do you know whether or not the sweatlodge ceremony performed by Mr. Ray on October 8
- 21 of 2009 -- was that audio recorded?
- 22 A. I do not know.
- Q. Do you believe that it was?
 - A. I don't. I would not think so.
 - MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection.

24

2

5

12

15

18

19

25

3

6

1 THE COURT: Sustained.

2 Q. BY MS. POLK: Did you see any

3 audio-recording equipment down around the sweat

lodge on that Thursday? 4

> Α. No.

5

Q. We've heard testimony about a 6

7 head-shaving activity that occurred on Sunday

evening. Were you present for that?

9 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection to the form

10 of the question.

THE WITNESS: Yes. 11

12 THE COURT: Overruled. The answer will stand.

Q. BY MS. POLK: Yes. You were present for 13

14 the head-shaving activity?

MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection to the

characterization "head shaving." There were 16

17 haircuts.

15

24

2

5

8

18

22

18 THE COURT: Sustained as to form.

19 Q. BY MS. POLK: You were present for the

20 that activity?

21 A. Yes.

22 **Q.** Were these haircuts or head shavings?

23 A. The first day was head shaving.

Q. Tell the jury how long the head shaving

activity lasted for, if you know.

270

1 A. I couldn't tell you a specific time.

Q. Were you present when participants had

3 their heads shaved?

4 A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall about how many had their

heads shaved on the first day? 6

A. Many. 7

Q. Did Mr. Ray shave his head?

A. No. 9

10 Q. Did you know two sisters named Simone and

11 so Soheyla Marzvaan?

12 A. Yes.

Q. How did you know them? 13

A. I knew them just the fact that they were 14

participants. 15

16 Q. You met them that week?

17 A. Yes.

Q. And do you know where the Marzvaan

sisters were from? 19

20 A. I would have to guess. I thought they

told me --21

MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection.

23 THE COURT: Sustained.

24 Q. BY MS. POLK: You don't need to guess if

you don't know.

A. Ok

Q. Did you become aware of the Marzvaan

sisters at some point during Spiritual

4 Warrior 2009?

A. Yes.

Tell the jury what made you become aware 6 Q.

7 of them.

8 Α. There was a problem with one of them.

They wanted to leave. 9

Q. Do you recall what day that was that 10

11 there was a problem?

It was the day of the Samurai Game.

Q. Do you recall what day that was? 13

Α. 14

> Q. Does Tuesday sound right for you for the

Samurai Game? Or I could actually -- I'll give you 16

the syntax. 17

A. The syntax. Yes.

So it would be Tuesday, October 6.

MR. KELLY: Judge, I'd ask the record reflect 20

that the witness refreshed her recollection with 21

22 Exhibit 253.

23 THE COURT: I think that was the case,

Ms. Polk. 24

MS. POLK: Yes, Your Honor.

272

Q. Do you recall what time of the day there 1

2 was a problem?

It was in the evening.

4 Q. And where were you when you became aware

of a problem? 5

I was there in the Crystal Hall.

Q. And you've used the word "problem." What 7

8 was the issue?

9 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection. Requires a

10 hearsay response.

THE COURT: Is it offered for the truth, 11

12 Ms. Polk?

MS. POLK: Your Honor, I'll rephrase the 13

14 question.

THE COURT: Okay.

16 BY MS. POLK: What did you become aware

17 of?

15

20

24

25

A. I became aware that one of the girls 18 19

wanted to leave. She was uncomfortable.

MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection. Strike

anything after "leave." 21

22 THE COURT: The answer "wanted to leave."

23 That's not offered for the truth?

MS. POLK: No, Your Honor. It's foundational.

THE COURT: Okay. So you may ask a question.

Q. BY MS. POLK: You just used the word -the term "girls." Do you recall approximately how old the Marzvaan sisters were?

A. No.

6

8

9

17

18

21

Q. Were they girls? Were they women? 7

A. They were female.

Q. So they were female?

10 A. Yeah.

Q. What drew your attention to the sister? 11

12 A. She was upset.

13 Q. And what was she doing that makes you 14 testify that she was upset?

A. She told me --15

16 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, objection.

THE COURT: I'm going to sustain that.

It has been 90 minutes, Ms. Polk and

Mr. Kelly. We started at a quarter after. So we 19

20 do need to take a recess for the evening.

MS. POLK: Okay.

22 MR. KELLY: I agree, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: So, ladies and gentlemen, we will

24 do that. And remember the admonition, all aspects

25 of it.

274

I do want to speak with Miss Martin for a

minute about the rule of exclusion of witnesses 2

that's been invoked in this case. And first thing

it means is that other witnesses can't be present

in court when witnesses are testifying. But it

also means that you cannot communicate about the

case or your testimony with any other witness until 7

it's -- until the trial is completely over. 8

9 And I'm also asking and directing people

10 not to communicate with third parties who might

relay information on about testimony in the case. 11

12 It's really a good idea not to talk to anyone about

13 the case until the matter is completely over.

However, you can talk to the lawyers as long as 14

15 other witnesses are not present.

16 Do you understand?

17

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So we will take the evening recess, then. 19

Please reassemble at 9:15. We'll start 20

as soon as we can after that. 21

We are in recess. Thank you.

22 23 24

18

(The proceedings concluded.)

```
ss: REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
    COUNTY OF VAVAPAT
               I, Mina G Hunt, do hereby certify that I
    am a Certified Reporter within the State of Arizona
    and Certified Shorthand Reporter in California.
               I further certify that these proceedings
    were taken in shorthand by me at the time and place
    herein set forth, and were thereafter reduced to
    typewritten form, and that the foregoing
10
     constitutes a true and correct transcript.
               I further certify that I am not related
12
    to, employed by, nor of counsel for any of the
13
    parties or attorneys herein, nor otherwise
14
    interested in the result of the within action.
15
               In witness whereof, I have affixed my
    signature this 1st day of April, 2011.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
                 MINA G. HUNT, AZ CR No. 50619
CA CSR No. 8335
24
```

| 1 | STATE OF ARIZONA) |
|----|---|
| 2 |) ss: REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI) |
| 3 | |
| 4 | I, Mina G. Hunt, do hereby certify that I |
| 5 | am a Certified Reporter within the State of Arizona |
| 6 | and Certified Shorthand Reporter in California. |
| 7 | I further certify that these proceedings |
| 8 | were taken in shorthand by me at the time and place |
| 9 | herein set forth, and were thereafter reduced to |
| 10 | typewritten form, and that the foregoing |
| 11 | constitutes a true and correct transcript. |
| 12 | I further certify that I am not related |
| 13 | to, employed by, nor of counsel for any of the |
| 14 | parties or attorneys herein, nor otherwise |
| 15 | interested in the result of the within action. |
| 16 | In witness whereof, I have affixed my |
| 17 | signature this 1st day of April, 2011. |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | , |
| 22 | la, chil |
| 23 | MINA G. HUNT, AZ CR NO. 50619 |
| 24 | MINA G. HUNT, AZ CR NO. 50619 CA CSR No. 8335 |
| 25 | |